

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Vol. XII.

No. 6

Chairman, Editorial Board: HIS GRACE THE
ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor: Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor: The Very Rev. J. M. T.
BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.

DEC.

1936

THE OBJECTIVITY OF MORALS. By ARNOLD LUNN.
ST. LEO AND THE LITURGY. By the Rev. J. D. CRICHTON.
THE SCOTTISH HIERARCHY IN 1560. By C. G. MORTIMER.
WOMEN AND CATHOLIC ACTION. By BARBARA GRANT JOHNSON.
A PLEA FOR ARCHITECTURE. By the Rev. B. V. MILES, D.D.

For other Features and Full Contents, see page 7.

THE UNIVERSE

184, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Monthly: £1 or 5 dollars per year post free.

RECREATION
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE
PRIVATE ROOM

BURNS OATES

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

**PRAYER BOOKS — MISSALS
GENERAL CATHOLIC LITERATURE**

*Theology, Philosophy, Hagiology, Biography, Fiction,
and Belles Lettres*

**THE PREMIER HOUSE FOR
CHURCH FURNITURE
CARVED WOOD-WORK
BRASS & SILVER WARE
STATUES & PICTURES**

**DEVOTIONAL ARTICLES
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION**

Catalogues, post free, to any address

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE Ltd.

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

And at Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow and Dublin.

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editor :
THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

Assistant Editor :
THE VERY REV. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.Scr.

VOLUME XII, No. 6.

DECEMBER, 1936.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE."
(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912. Ltd.)
184, Strand, London, W.C.2

BOOKS RECEIVED

SOME SISTERS OF MINE, by Marie René-Bazin. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 223 pp. 5s.)

SOVIET MAN—NOW, by Helen Iswolsky, translated by E. F. Peeler. (London: Sheed & Ward. 86 pp. 2s. 6d.)

THE PRAYERS OF THE MISSAL: 1, The Sunday Collects, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. (London: Sheed & Ward. 92 pp. 2s. 6d.)

PEACE AND THE CLERGY, by a German Priest, translated by Conrad M. R. Bonacina. (London: Sheed & Ward. 166 pp. 5s.)

TEACHING THE CATECHISM, by the Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. Part II. (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 49 pp. 1s. 6d.)

TEACHING THE CATECHISM, by the Rev. F. H. Drinkwater. Part III. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 57 pp. 1s. 6d.)

THE EARLY BUDDHIST THEORY OF MAN PERFECTED, by I. B. Horner. (London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 328 pp. 12s. 6d.)

GOD AND THE SUPERNATURAL, by M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., Christopher Dawson, C. C. Martindale, S.J., E. I. Watkin. (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 252 pp. 5s.)

A LITERARY HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN FRANCE, by Henri Bremond. Vol. III. The Triumph of Mysticism. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 585 pp. 16s.)

THE ROMAN BREVIARY, Winter. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 15s. and 21s. morocco.)

HISTORIC ENGLISH CONVENTS OF TO-DAY, by Dom Basil Whelan, O.S.B. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 277 pp. 7s. 6d.)

TEACHING AND PREACHING RELIGION TO CHILDREN, by Rev. John K. Sharp, A.M., S.T.B. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 155 pp. \$1.50.)

THE VATICAN COUNCIL, by Dom Cuthbert Butler. Vols. I and II. (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 300 pp. and 309 pp. 12s., cheaper edition.)

FATHER WILLIAM DOYLE, S.J.: A Spiritual Study, by Professor Alfred O'Rahilly. (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 613 pp. 6s., cheap edition.)

GODS OF TO-MORROW, by William Teeling. (London: Lovat Dickson, Ltd. 376 pp. 12s. 6d.)

PRAYER IN FAITH, by the Rev. Mother Janet Erskine Stuart. First Series, From Advent to Pentecost; Second Series, From Pentecost to Advent. (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 138 pp. and 151 pp. 3s. 6d. each.)

LE LIVRE DES PSAUMES, par Jean Calès S.J., Vols I and II. (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils.)

DICTIONARY OF WRITERS OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY, by Josiah Cox Russell, Ph.D., Being Special Supplement No. 3 to the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research. (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 210 pp. 7s. 6d.)

THE CROSS AND THE STAR OF DAVID, by Walter Heinrich Friedemann, translated by E. F. Peeler. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 299 pp. 7s. 6d.)

SACKCLOTH AND ASHES, by Dom Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 93 pp. 3s. 6d.)

PURGATORY, by Dr. Bernhard Bartmann, translated from the German by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 246 pp. 7s. 6d.)

RECOLLECTIONS OF ROME, by Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, abridged edition, with a foreword by the Most Rev. Arthur Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 181 pp. 5s.)

THE ROMAN PRIMACY TO A.D. 461, by B. J. Kidd, D.D. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 159 pp. 5s.)

THE RELIGION OF WORDSWORTH, by A. D. Martin. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 100 pp. 3s. 6d.)

MOSLEM WOMEN ENTER A NEW WORLD, by Ruth Frances Woodsmall. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 432 pp. 12s. 6d.)

LIVING RELIGIONS AND MODERN THOUGHT, by Alban G. Widgey. (London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 306 pp. 12s. 6d.)

AND PILATE WROTE A TITLE, by Rev. Franz Johannes Weinrich, translated by Rev. Joseph W. Grundner. (London: B. Herder Book Co. 254 pp. 10s. 6d.)

JESUS AND HIS MOTHER, Sketches by Rev. Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S. (New York: Frederick Pustet Co., Inc.; London: B. Herder Book Co. 262 pp. 8s.)

THE CHILDREN'S BIBLE HISTORY FOR THE USE OF CHRIST'S LITTLE ONES, by Rev. S. A. Raemers, M.A., Ed.M., Ph.D. (St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder Book Co. 224 pp. 2s. 6d.)

THE MYSTICAL CHRIST, by Rev. John C. Gruden, S.T.L. (London: B. Herder Book Co. 343 pp. 12s. 6d.)

PSYCHOLOGY, by Paul J. Glenn, Ph.D., S.T.D. (London: B. Herder Book Co. 391 pp. 10s. 6d.)

THE UNIVERSE

THE MOST WIDELY-READ
CATHOLIC PAPER

TWOPENCE WEEKLY.

By Post, 12s. 6d. per year.

184, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

CONTENTS

DECEMBER, 1936

ARTICLES:—

	PAGE
1. The Objectivity of Morals, By ARNOLD LUNN	429
2. St. Leo and the Liturgy, By the Rev. J. D. CRICHTON	437
3. The Scottish Hierarchy in 1560, By C. G. MORTIMER	442
4. Women and Catholic Action, By BARBARA GRANT JOHNSON	451
5. A Plea For Architecture, By the Rev. B. V. MILLER, D.D.	459

HOMILETICS:—

By the Rev. R. H. J. STEUART, S.J.	464
--------------------------------------------	-----

NOTES ON RECENT WORK:—

I. Ascetical and Mystical Theology, By the Rev. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.	476
II. Economics and Sociology, By the Rev. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.)	480
III. History, By the Rev. PHILIP HUGHES, L.Sc.Hist.	484
IV. Liturgical Arts and Crafts, By the Rev. J. P. REDMOND	489

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:—

(1) Intention of Receiving Baptism	495
(2) Interior of Tabernacle	496
(3) Collection During Exposition	497
(4) Blessing of Motor Cars	497
(5) Veneration of a "Beatus"	498
By the Very Rev. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	

BOOK REVIEWS	499
------------------------	-----

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD	501
-------------------------------	-----

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD:—

Central Europe, By C. F. MELVILLE	504
------------------------------------------------	-----

CORRESPONDENCE	506
--------------------------	-----

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE OBJECTIVITY OF MORALS

BY ARNOLD LUNN.

GOD was the measure of all things for the Hebrew; Man for the Greek. The literature and the social philosophy of the Hebrew were permeated by religious implications. He accepted a code imposed upon him from above, delivered to Moses in that burning mountain up which only the chosen of God might be led. "We were afraid by reason of the fire and went not up into the mountain."

Olympus was the official residence of the Greek gods, but they moved freely among men and reflected their pleasures, their ambitions and their vices, and the many-sided personalities of their many-sided worshippers. There was no treachery to which a Greek god would not stoop, no lechery which he would not commit. The gods did not impose their code upon the Greeks, the Greeks imposed their code upon Olympus. The thief prayed to Mercury for protection; the Greek who wished to get drunk addressed himself to Dionysus, and for success in love he asked the intercession of Aphrodite.

The humanism which finds expression in the famous saying of Protagoras: "Man is the measure of all things," is the basic doctrine of classical Hellenism. In the modern world the Catholic Church is the heir of the Hebrew, the one institution which is uncompromising in the belief in an external objective code imposed from above. Protestantism is gradually losing all power to resist the increasing encroachment of the humanism which measures all things by the standards of man. God was the hero of the Bible, Man is the hero of the new revelation. Religion outside the Catholic Church is a means to an end, and that end the securing of a Utopia on earth rather than eternal beatitude in heaven. Social justice, which to the Catholic is the inevitable conclusion of the supernatural premise, is

both premise and conclusion to the extremer Modernists. Modernism does not deny God, but it ignores Him. Protagoras, not Christ, is the prophet of this desupernaturalized Christianity.

Modernism is due to a failure of nerve. It is inspired by the panic fear that religion can only survive if harmonized with contemporary fashions. The supernatural is unfashionable and therefore suspect. It is the miraculous element in Christianity which keeps the man in the street—in the street. All that is necessary to lure him back into the pew is to jettison as many Christian dogmas as possible.

No miscalculation could be more complete. Many years before I became a Catholic I asked Dean Inge how he could account for the fact that whereas Catholics were filling churches faster than they could build them, the leakage from Protestant congregations became more and more pronounced with every surrender of Catholic doctrine and with every new approximation to the views with which Dr. Inge is identified?

The Dean, after a moment of gloomy silence, remarked contemptuously: "My explanation is the same as Carlyle's. Mankind are mostly fools."

But surely there is nothing particularly foolish in the commonsense view that it is reasonable to go to church if we can get something in church which we cannot get elsewhere, but that it is a waste of time to sit in a pew to listen to a clergyman denying the doctrines of the Church from which he draws his stipend.

An eminent Baptist recently attributed the catastrophic decline in Baptist congregations to the preoccupation of Baptist ministers with the League of Nations and Labour politics. People who want to hear political speeches go to political meetings. A Church which speaks as politicians speak will lose its followers, but the Church which speaks as never man spake will endure to the end. The inevitable consequence of measuring all things by the measure of man is a revolt, at first uneasy and timid, and finally open and unashamed, against the very conception of a moral code imposed from above.

Professor Bethune Baker, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in a university founded by Catholics (Cambridge), expresses himself thus on the subject of morality:

"Of course, we should prefer not to have to represent the command as coming from outside, but to treat the urge to higher life as the bidding of man's own nature," and of the "moral and spiritual values," he writes. "They are not imposed from without, but they arise from within his own nature, and are the output of himself."¹

It is inevitable that this new humanism should undermine not only our belief in objective truth, but also our belief in objective morality. "It does not matter," we are assured, "what a man believes provided he behaves himself, and it does not matter how he behaves provided he does not injure his neighbour." Man's neighbour, that is, man, is thus made the measure not only of truth but of morality. Morality must conform to the measure of man, and God must presumably change as man changes.

Now it was the belief in an objective standard of morality imposed from without, and accepted on the authority of One who spake as never man spake, which revolutionized the face of the world. Professor Jung, the famous psychologist, is no friend of Christianity, and his unwilling tribute is therefore very impressive. He explains the initial triumph of Christianity by "the enormous feeling of redemption from the ancient brutality of the pagan world. These old truths are empty to us," he writes. "Most certainly we should still understand them had our customs even a breath of the ancient brutality, for we can hardly realize in this age the whirlwinds of the unchained libido which roared through the ancient Rome of the Cæsars."

The unchained libido is beginning to roar quite lustily in our modern capitals. If you doubt this read Dr. Alexis Carrel's tremendous indictment of modern American civilization in his book *Man the Unknown*. Dr. Carrel's verdict confirms the verdict of those mid-Victorian Christians who prophesied the "brave new world" in which we are now living. The Bishops were more scientific in their forecasts than those sentimental secularists who founded Ethical Societies and Ethical Churches to preserve the traditional morality which

¹ I have given further quotations from his book *Ways of Modernism* in my book *Now I See*, page 197.

they respected while doing their best to destroy the creed which is the foundation of that morality. In the sixties and seventies of the last century the Christian code was a controversial asset to the Christian apologist. The secularist who professed to respect this code was embarrassed by the difficulty of convincing the doubter that the code in question would survive the disappearance of the Christian creed, but to-day the traditional morality of Christian Europe is no longer an argument for Christianity but a stick with which to beat Christians. The pagan world in which we live is in revolt against the restrictions which Christianity seeks to impose upon sexual indulgence. The old compromise between supernaturalism and humanism which Protestantism attempts to effect is breaking down all along the line. All that remains of this compromise is an odd inconsistent respect for the person of Christ. Those who reject His claims are none the less overawed by the deity which they deny, and are anxious not to dissociate too explicitly their creed from His.

This Christ of theirs whom they profess to admire is not the uncompromising Christ of the Gospels but a prophet remoulded nearer to their heart's desire. There is no conflict between the pain-dreading, comfort-loving creed of the humanists and the emasculated Christianity of the humanists. This new Christ of theirs overflows with indiscriminating and sloppy benevolence. The hard sayings are forgotten, the hard edges of Christianity blurred. The gentle spirit of the true Jesus, we are assured, would have been dismayed by the stern discipline of the Catholic marriage code. Jesus would never have asked His followers to accept one of two alternatives, both equally unpleasant, self-control or a large family. In His eyes there was only one sin, censoriousness, and the new humanist ends his lay sermon on this note with his favourite text: "Her sins are forgiven her because she loved much."

The humanist comes forward as the liberator, the prophet who frees men from the taboos of religion, and relieves them of all irksome restrictions. The new morality relieves the husband of the obligations which he contracted to the wife whom he no longer loves. It relieves married people of their obligation to achieve the principal end for which marriage was ordained. The new

morality is indeed nothing more than the rationalization of the will to relieve.

It is, however, an illusion to suppose that you set men free by relieving them of their obligations. On the contrary, this humanism which has destroyed the loyalty of men to One whose service is perfect freedom, has proved the handmaid of tyranny and laid the foundation of the totalitarian state.

I remember a debate on the New Morality at the Oxford Union at which a young man rose and said: "This new morality isn't new. It isn't morality. It's just our old friend Lust." He paused and pointed an incriminatory finger at the opposition benches and continued: "And let me tell you what's wrong with all of you. You're just sinners."

Few people sincerely believe in this new morality. They appeal to it to justify their own lapses, but are just as ready to invoke the traditional code when it suits them. Consistency has never been a characteristic of modern prophets in general or of a certain modern in particular, whose austere defence of adultery has helped to lower the age of consent and to raise still further the age of dissent.

His contention that a too rigid fidelity is destructive of ideal married relations was enthusiastically endorsed by his mistress, but provoked the tepid disapproval of his wife who, though enlightened and progressive, still retained a few lingering Victorian prejudices. These prejudices were finally removed by a handsome young man who professed himself an enthusiastic convert to the professor's doctrine of intermittent adultery as the foundation of a successful marriage, and who presented the professor with a son as a small mark of his esteem for the professor's views.

Was the professor pleased? He was not. He said all the sort of things that an outraged husband used to say in the unenlightened past. The good professor, you see, only accepted Protagoras' dictum with a difference. The professor was the measure of all things, and what he said went—for the professor. But not for the father of the son of the wife of the professor. The ten commandments, one gathered, still remained in force so far as that young man was concerned.

The professor is a typical modern. He had thought out nothing to its ultimate conclusion. There are many popular prophets like him in the modern world, men whose sexual philosophy represents the mood of the moment. In such circles there is much fine talk about freedom from inhibitions and genial sneers at the outmoded morality of the Catholic, but if the Catholic takes them at their word and assumes that they mean what they say, they are the first to raise a fearful hullabaloo of outraged innocence. An amusing instance of this queer blend of conventional unconventionality and conventional conventionality was obligingly provided by Professor J. B. S. Haldane in our recent controversy.

"Fortunately for our peace of mind," he writes,² "we modern infidels unlike our grandparents often go in unashamedly for a good deal of sexual fun which you can conscientiously condemn."

Haldane, who is Professor of Genetics at the University of London, is more convincing as an expert on the mating of *Drosophila* than as a sexual funnyman. But when in another connection I remarked that "self-restraint is uncomfortable, and it is therefore tempting to rationalize one's dislike of the code and represent it as an intellectual objection to the creed," he accused me of slinging mud. It is difficult to compete with a man who poses at one moment as an emancipated modern with engagingly modern views about sexual fun, and the next moment bridles like an outraged Victorian because one hints that "sexual fun" may explain some apostasies from the Church.

I don't resent his efforts to clothe Aunt Sally Lunn in a crinoline, but I don't see why he should borrow my crinoline to disguise the nudity of his views on "sexual fun."

But then, of course, one does not expect consistency from the emotional secularist. The cheerful pagan who has no interest in religion, and who "goes in unashamedly for a good deal of sexual fun" is as consistent as the Christian. The modernist who still claims the great name of Christian, but who has surrendered to the humanist on divorce and on contraception, is as

² *Science and the Supernatural*, page 63.

inconsistent as the old-fashioned Victorian secularist, such as T. H. Huxley, who hoped to retain the Christian code while attacking the Christian creed. Huxley was the product of his age, a Puritan agnostic who never drew the logical conclusions from the secularist premise. In a letter to Charles Kingsley he quoted indignantly St. Paul's "What advantages it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Huxley, a sentimental agnostic, was disedified by the realism of St. Paul. The modern is more consistent. "The dead rise not," says the modern, "therefore let us go in unashamedly for a good deal of sexual fun."

And, of course, he is right . . . if the dead rise not.

The belief in extinction among those to whom death is the end produces social results in the modern world not dissimilar to those provoked in ancient Athens by the plague which Thucydides so vividly describes.

"The plague," writes Thucydides, "was responsible for an ever-increasing lawlessness, for where men had previously tried to conceal the fact that they were actuated solely by motives of pleasure, they now made no such pretence. They saw the suddenness with which fortunes changed both in the case of the rich who suddenly died and of the poor who no less suddenly inherited the property of others. They determined, therefore, to extract from life such pleasures as were most rapidly obtainable and most satisfying to their lusts, for they regarded their bodies and their wealth as equally transitory. No man was anxious to practise self-denial in the hope of achieving honour because everybody felt that they were unlikely to live long enough to attain to it. And so the pleasure of the moment and everything which contributed to it were deemed to be both honourable and opportune. Men were restrained neither by the fear of the gods nor by the law, for on the one hand since the same death overwhelmed everybody, they saw that piety and impiety led to the same result, and on the other hand nobody expected that he would live long enough to be called to account or to pay the penalty for his crime. On the contrary they felt that the penalty which had already been pronounced against them was far more severe than any other conceivable punishment, and that it was

therefore only reasonable to extract what pleasure they could from life before the penalty was imposed."

Now if the dead rise not there is little difference *sub specie aeternitas* between the few score years which is all that the youngest can hope for, and the few days or weeks which represented the expectation of life in plague-stricken Athens. If death be the end, and if piety and impiety lead to the same result, it is only reasonable to concentrate on the pleasures which are "most easily obtainable and most satisfying to the lusts." This being so, it is not in the least surprising that the decline of belief in immortality is producing in our own era social effects not so very dissimilar to those provoked by the plague in ancient Athens.

ST. LEO AND THE LITURGY

BY THE REV. J. D. CRICHTON.

ALTHOUGH the influence of St. Leo on the Roman Rite is not easily traceable in matters of detail, a constant reading of his sermons induces the conviction that the language of the Liturgy owes perhaps more to St. Leo, after St. Jerome, than to anyone else. The language of the collects is so like that of St. Leo that his sermons seem at times to be but the concatenation of a number of collects—a sort of “collect sequence.” The tantalizing thing is that it is very difficult to trace this or that collect to its lair. Nor does the “Leonine Sacramentary” help one because it is quite clear that it is neither a sacramentary nor strictly speaking Leonine. The attribution by its finder, one Bianchini, to St. Leo must be put in the category of brilliant guesses. However that may be, is it not more than likely that at least some of the “sacramentary” may be attributed to St. Leo, especially as Mgr. Duchesne,¹ although he puts its date towards the end of the sixth century, establishes beyond doubt that it is a collection taken from many sources. Moreover, the tendency of modern scholarship is all in St. Leo's favour. Père Cayré, for instance, writes:² “Mgr. Duchesne (*Orig. du culte chrét.*, 1909, p. 120-125³) en retarde la composition jusqu'à la fin du VI^e siècle, et en fait une œuvre privée, qui d'ailleurs souvent s'inspirerait de S. Léon. Cependant nombre de liturgistes continuent à le regarder comme une œuvre du V^e siècle et à l'attribuer même, du moins en partie, à ce pape.” This is supported by Eisenhofer in his *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*⁴ who quotes Probst, Edmund Bishop and Rule as being of the same opinion. The latest opinion is that of Mgr. Callewaert,⁵ who writes: “Vix dubitandum quin

¹ For reference see below, n. 3.

² *Précis de Patrologie*, Tome II, Desclée, Paris, p. 132, n. 5.

³ English edition *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, fifth edition, 1931, pp. 135 ff.

⁴ Freiburg, 1931, I, pp. 61-62.

⁵ *Liturgicae Institutiones; Tract. 1^{us}, De Sacra Liturgia Universim*; ed. 3^a, Bruges, 1933, p. 30.

composuerit *nonnullas ex orationibus*⁶ quae exhibet sacramentum Leonianum; ipsi probabiliter tribuenda est *Expositio symboli* pro catechumenis in ordine baptismi in Gelasiano." My aim in this paper is to supply a little evidence of St. Leo's authorship of one of these collects and then show St. Leo's influence as it persists in our present Roman Rite.

The evidence, small enough perhaps, but significant, is to be found in his fifth Christmas sermon.⁷ There one finds these phrases: "Filius Dei . . . dignatus est humanitatis nostrae particeps fieri . . . (factus est homo nostri generis) ut nos divinae naturae possimus esse consortes." If you put alongside of that the "Deus qui humanae substantiae . . . da nobis per huius aquae et vini mysterium *eius divinitatis esse consortes qui humanitatis nostrae fieri dignatus est particeps*, Jesus Christus, etc.", it will be seen that the two are identical. There is a further very important hint to be found in the Twelfth Sermon on the Passion. There we find this phrase: "idem *naturam nostram* ab aeternitatis arce deiectam amissae *restitueret dignitati* et cuius erat *conditor* esset etiam *reformator*." Comparing this with the first part of the prayer: "Deus qui *humanae substantiae dignitatem* mirabiliter *condidisti* et mirabilis *reformasti* . . ." not only is the thought identical but the words are nearly the same. Nouns are used in the sermon and verbs in the prayer—that is the only obvious, and necessary, difference. Thus practically the whole prayer can be reconstructed from these two sermons of St. Leo. Now, one is informed that the "Deus qui humanae" is to be found in the *Leonine Sacramentary* as a prayer for Christmas Day,⁸ and the alternatives are either that someone else made up the prayer out of these words in the sermon,⁹ or that St. Leo himself wrote the prayer. There is no *proof* for either view but it is difficult to believe that St. Leo with his incomparable gift of phrase should have left the work to be done by some peddling papal secretary. Moreover, the polish

⁶ Italics mine here.

⁷ Serm. de Nat., V.

⁸ Cf. for example, Fortescue: *The Mass*, p. 306, second edition.

⁹ This is suggested, v.g., by Havard in Cabrol's *Origines*, App. II—quoted in Lucas, S.J., *Holy Mass*, Vol. I, pp. 42 and 43.

and finality of the phrases as they occur in the sermon suggest perhaps that St. Leo had *already* composed the prayer and that he was unconsciously quoting himself. In any case, what is really more important is that St. Leo is shown to be the true parent of this magnificent prayer.¹⁰

A few more instances drawn from a reading that cannot pretend to be systematic, may be of interest. The fine collect for the fourth Sunday after Easter contains at least one phrase of St. Leo's. The collect reads: "Deus qui fidelium mentes unius efficit voluntatis, da populis tuis id amare quod praecipis, id desiderare quod promittis; ut *inter mundanas varietates* ibi nostra fixa sint corda, ubi vera sunt gaudia." In St. Leo's second sermon for Easter we find the words: "*inter omnes* namque *vitae huius varietates*."¹¹ It is not much perhaps, but the coincidence is all the more remarkable occurring as it does in an Easter sermon. The whole prayer is unmistakably Leonine in structure and thought. The "*ibi nostra fixa sint corda*," etc., is echoed in "*nec vos impediunt terrena quibus sunt parata coelestia*."¹² There is also a reflection of the same idea in the other Easter sermon.¹³ "Non ergo nos rerum temporalium occupent species, nec ad se contemplationem nostram a coelestibus terrena deflectant. Pro transactis habeantur quae ex maxima parte iam non sunt: et mens intenta mansuris, *ibi desiderium suum figat ubi quod offertur aeternum est*." It will be seen at once that here in sermon form are the same ideas which appear with the greater force and clarity which the collect form gives.

The collect for the Third Sunday after Pentecost reads: "Protector in te sperantium, Deus, *sine quo nihil est validum, nihil sanctum*. . . ." We can see the hand

¹⁰ I am not unaware that some MSS. read "*humilitatis*" for "*humanitatis*" in the sermon quoted, but as the editors in Migne point out (*in loc.*) "*humilitas*" is frequently used by St. Leo for "*humanitas*" so the *meaning* is the same in any case. Moreover, as we have no critical edition of St. Leo (would that we had!), it remains to be seen what is the original reading.

¹¹ *De Resurr.*, II.

¹² Serm. de Epiph., I, and cf. Serm. de Jeiunio Pent., II.

¹³ *De Resurr.*, I.

of St. Leo in that if we compare it with "nihil sine illa (scil. fide) sanctum, nihil castum est, nihil vivum."¹⁴ Finally, there is a remarkable likeness between the prayer in the Requiem Mass "Fidelium, Deus, omnium conditor et redemptor . . ." and "*Deus humani generis conditor et redemptor* qui nos ad promissiones vitae aeternae per semitas vult ambulare iustitiae," etc.¹⁵ It also shows how naturally St. Leo wrote in what might be called the "collect style."

Three further instances may be given of St. Leo's influence in another part of the Liturgy. The "Communicantes" for Christmas would seem to owe something to St. Leo. "*Communicantes et diem sacratissimum celebrantes, quo beatae Mariae intemerata virginitas huic mundo edidit Salvatorem.*" In Sermon I De Epiphania we read: "*Celebrato proximo die quo intemerata virginitas humani generis edidit Salvatorem. . . .*" And if you want the "*dies sacratissimus*" it will be found towards the end of the second sermon on the Epiphany.¹⁶ Comment is unnecessary. The same sermon¹⁷ contains a hint of the Epiphany "Communicantes." "*Communicantes et diem sacratissimum celebrantes quo Unigenitus tuus in tua tecum gloria coaeternus in veritate carnis nostrae visibiliter corporalis apparuit. . . .*" In the sermon we read: "*Honoretur itaque a nobis sacratissimus dies in quo salutis nostrae auctor apparuit. . . .*" Compare with this: "*sed etiam ipsa Veritas visibilis et corporalis apparuit*"¹⁸ and "*Hodie Verbum Dei carne apparuit vestitum et quod nunquam fuit humanis oculis visibile, coepit etiam manibus esse tractabile. Hodie genitum in nostrae carnis animaeque substantia Salvatorem angelicis vocibus didicere pastores et apud dominicorum praesules gregum hodie evangelizandi forma praecondita est ut nos quoque cum coelestis militiae dicamus exercitu: Gloria in excelsis Deo. . . .*"¹⁹ These two quotations alone show the close similarity between the Preface and Communicantes of the Liturgy

¹⁴ Sermon. De Nat., IV.

¹⁵ Sermon. De Jeiunio Septimi Mensis, II.

¹⁶ All this was pointed out long ago by Quesnell in his edition of St. Leo (*in loc. edit.*, 1700, p. 88, n. 1).

¹⁷ De Epiph., II, versus finem.

¹⁸ Sermon. De Nat., III.

¹⁹ Sermon. De Nat., VI.

and the style of St. Leo. Where the words are not the same, the underlying thought is. Compare, for instance, the "in substantia nostrae mortalitatis" of the Preface with "in nostrae carnis animæque substantia" of the sermon; the likeness is remarkable. Further, the "cum coelestis militiae" of the second quotation gives even stronger probability to the suggestion that St. Leo wrote this Preface and Communicantes. The whole quotation reads rather like an impromptu Preface.

Finally, to bring this collection of notes to a close somewhere, I would draw attention to the second responsory of the first nocturn of Christmas Matins: "Hodie illuxit nobis dies redemptionis novae, reparationis antiquae, felicitatis aeternae."²⁰ This is taken straight from St. Leo's second Christmas sermon.²¹ At what date it was inserted into the Christmas Office I am unaware (perhaps the experts will tell us), but there it is, typical St. Leo, summing up in three phrases the whole doctrine of the Incarnation.

And there I must end. Perhaps the suggestions put forward in this paper are already known among scholars. But I make no apology. The scholars are to blame for keeping their treasures to themselves. If they are not known, I hope they may help others to realize the part that that great pope and theologian, St. Leo, has played in the formation of the Roman Rite. Whether this or that proof (such as they are) be accepted, does not matter so much, but may even the few words written here serve to show that the thought and style of St. Leo have left an indelible mark upon the Liturgy, giving it that admirable conciseness and dignity which are perhaps its chief glory.²²

²⁰ Some MSS. read "praeparationis" for "reparationis."

²¹ De Nat., II.

²² I have made no mention of St. Leo's addition to the Canon of the Mass, "sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam," as being a matter of common knowledge. On internal evidence alone, Quesnell fathers upon him the Prefaces used at the Ordinations of priests and the Consecrations of bishops. Further, St. Leo would seem to have had something to do with a chant reform (Cf. Aigrain, *La Musique Religieuse*, p. 22). At any rate, there is a constant tradition of St. Leo's liturgical activity but no detailed work, I believe, has been attempted on the subject.

THE SCOTTISH HIERARCHY IN 1560

BY C. G. MORTIMER.

MOST people are fully aware that at the opening of the reign of Elizabeth the Act of Uniformity was carried on April 28th, 1559, by a bare majority of three votes and without the support of a single spiritual peer. Moreover, on this occasion the last voice of the old Catholic Hierarchy was heard in noble and determined protest. There was a scene analogous to this in many respects, enacted in the Scottish Estates in 1560 about which there is still considerable ignorance prevalent among students of Church History—those fatal days when the old Scottish Hierarchy was faced by Knox and his supporters. In both countries the suppression of the old Religion followed; but the peculiar conditions under which this result was secured in Scotland demand careful study and suggest further the important question: how did the old Hierarchy fare in this hour of trial? Did they acquit themselves as valiant confessors of the Faith, in accordance with the fine example of the English Hierarchy in whose ranks there was but a single traitor?

In the year 1559 was held the last Scottish Provincial Council. Its purpose was mainly the reform of the Church, long overdue in Scotland; an endeavour to stem moral depravity and ignorance. Many excellent resolutions were passed and the Assembly broke up having appointed Septuagesima Sunday, 1560, for its next meeting. Little did its members dream that they had assisted at the last Provincial Council of the ancient Church. It was not until a date in August, 1886, three hundred and twenty-six years afterwards, that a restored diocesan Hierarchy met once more in Council in Fort Augustus.

What, then, was this tragic blow that severed for so long the normal links of ecclesiastical history?

It forms no part of this essay to sketch the general causes of the Reformation in Scotland nor of its progress prior to 1560; we would call the attention of the reader rather to that central and responsible body of men, the

Bishops of Scotland, and try to determine their composition and conduct at this crucial hour; for this thread of history has often been tangled in the past and the work of straightening it, if possible, is surely worth while. Moreover, the solution of this particular problem will serve to throw a light upon the general course of events and help us to understand why and how far the reformers could claim the victory.

The Estates assembled at Edinburgh on August 1st, 1560. The Scottish Parliament was a single House, not two as in England. It has often been said that this meeting of the Estates was illegal and its Acts invalid for it had been provided by the Treaty of Edinburgh in the previous July that every matter connected with religion in Scotland should be settled by arrangement between the Sovereign and Commissioners, appointed by Parliament. But when human passion is running high and pent-up forces of human will and desire find at last a means of outlet, treaties and stipulations are flung to the winds. The Lords of the Congregation were not to be gainsaid. The Parliament was packed, for in addition to its usual members a large number of the lesser barons discovered at last a pretext for attending this session, though they had taken no part in Parliamentary proceedings for nearly a century. But this particular revolution interested them and their motive was largely cupidity; indeed, without their help Knox himself might have been powerless.

But we must turn at once to the first important question of this essay: What members of the Episcopate were present during the debates of August, 1560?

If we understand the word Bishop in the widest sense possible and include all those who were in any way connected with the thirteen Scottish sees *circa* 1560, we shall find that eight members of the Hierarchy were present and five absent.

Those present were:

John Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews
 Robert Creighton, Bishop of Dunkeld
 William Chisholm, Bishop of Dunblane
 James Hamilton, Bishop-elect of Argyle
 Alexander Gordon, Archbishop of Athens, Elect of
 Galloway
 John Campbell, Bishop-elect of the Isles.

Among those who enrolled themselves as Commendators at this meeting we find the names of the other two Bishops who were present :

Robert, Commendator of Holyrood House, i.e., Robert Stewart, Bishop-elect of Caithness; a layman.

Donald, Abbot of Cupar, i.e., Donald Campbell, Bishop-elect of Brechin; never consecrated.

The five absentees were :

James Beaton II, Archbishop of Glasgow

William Gordon, Bishop of Aberdeen

Patrick Hepburn, Bishop of Moray

Henry Sinclair, Bishop of Ross (but he had only received the temporalities of the see by this date)

Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney.

We have now to ask two further questions : (1) Which of these remained Catholic and which embraced the Reformation? (2) How many of them were duly consecrated Bishops?

To the first question we answer : the faithful Bishops were St. Andrews, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Moray, Dunblane, Ross. And the apostates were : Galloway, Caithness, Orkney, Argyle, Brechin. There is no evidence as to the religious views of John Campbell.

To the second question we answer : duly consecrated Bishops were St. Andrews, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Moray, Dunblane, Ross, Orkney and Galloway (Alexander Gordon). But the following *never* received episcopal consecration : Brechin, Caithness, The Isles, and Argyle, as named in the above list.

Now it has been frequently asserted in the past that no consecrated Bishop in Scotland accepted the Reformation. It would be pleasant to believe this, but unfortunately it is not historical. If our view is correct, two consecrated Bishops joined the ranks of the Reformers. They were : Alexander Gordon (Galloway) and Adam Bothwell (Orkney). Since this is a serious accusation, we pause to give detailed evidence on these points.

Alexander Gordon. He was the brother of the Earl of Huntly, one of the leading Catholic peers, and was connected with no less than four different Scottish sees : Caithness, Glasgow, the Isles and Galloway. We need not follow the details of his career but the proof that

he was a Bishop is this: he was provided to Glasgow on March 5th, 1550, consecrated in Rome and received the pallium. But he never went to Glasgow; he resigned in 1551 and was made—"translated," is perhaps the more accurate expression—Archbishop of Athens *in partibus infidelium*. This proves he was a consecrated Bishop. All titular Bishops have been duly consecrated. It was never an honorary title; there is, of course, no such thing. He was promised the next vacant Scottish see and became Bishop-elect of the Isles in 1553 but received no Papal confirmation. He was in fact expecting translation to Galloway, but beyond gaining a tack¹ of the temporalities he never became its properly constituted Bishop. None the less he had Episcopal consecration, as we have seen, in Rome.

Adam Bothwell. The evidence given by Dowden in his great work, *The Bishops of Scotland*, pp. 267-8, seems adequate. According to this authority he was consecrated before June 30th, 1559.

None of the other apostates had received episcopal consecration; not all in fact were even priests though they were "Bishops-elect." As regards the absentees perhaps one note will suffice. Why was James Beaton, the Archbishop of Glasgow, absent? The answer is that he made good his escape out of Scotland with the French ships on July 19th and had already settled in Paris where he acted as Ambassador. His death did not occur until 1603; he was in fact the last survivor of the old Hierarchy of Scotland, just as Bishop Goldwell, who also died abroad, in 1585, was the last survivor of the former English Hierarchy. The question might be asked: Was he justified in leaving his country at such a crisis? It was at least a measure of prudence, and two of the English Bishops also escaped before the net closed round them. His long exemplary life and service to the Scottish Crown seem to absolve him from any charge of faint-heartedness.

We come now to the actual meeting of the Estates and the part that the Bishops played in it; the first impression we get is that the small band of faithful Bishops played a most disappointing part, but the facts

¹ Tack = tenth.

need the most careful survey. Moreover, the evidence is scanty though perhaps just sufficient.

For the first eight days the only subject discussed was the legality of the Assembly. It is quite possible that the Catholic Bishops made their chief protest at this time and showed whatever resistance they could muster. It is also certain that they were threatened and intimidated so far as their opponents dared. Next the Protestant Petition was introduced praying for the total abolition of the Catholic Church and attacking the whole body of the clergy in gross and violent terms.

Next, after four days, the Reformers presented their Confession of Faith. The house was packed and debate may have seemed useless under these conditions to the Bishops, but at any rate it was then that there was some kind of interposition on the part of the faithful. It was left to the Primate, with the Bishops of Dunkeld and Dunblane to demand delay; and with them stood the Abbot of Kilwinning. But, on the whole, we get the impression that the faithful locked themselves up in a chilling silence and were derided by their enemies for their impotence. "Dumb dogs" they were called by Knox, and the words of the Earl Marischal are well known: "Seeing that my lords . . . speak nothing to the contrary of the doctrine proposed, I cannot but hold it to be the very truth of God and the contrary to be deceivable doctrine." All this was very unpleasant hearing for the faithful Bishops and one wonders to this day if it was challenged and the record of the challenge has been suppressed; or if, indeed, they thought that so illegal a debate was beneath their notice. In any case having listened apparently to their own condemnation on August 17th they learnt seven days later that the Pope's jurisdiction and authority were henceforth abolished, and the Mass forbidden.

How at the present day are we to judge the Catholic Bishops? Can we attempt a judgment? Can we at least elucidate their motives by historical enquiry? In part, at any rate. Let us recall, first, that the Bishops were no longer a united body; several were unconsecrated and unfit for the task in hand; that not even the English Bishops were able to avert the doom of deprivation; that their Scottish brethren were facing a more virulent attack, a more drastic revolution. But when all that is said,

their attitude is curious, to say the least, and at times pusillanimous. Did Archbishop Hamilton really grasp the nature of the crisis? Writing on August 18th to the Archbishop of Glasgow, now, as we have seen, in Paris, he says :

I must make this little billet to your lordship more that remembrance be not lost between us than for any matters of importance. [And this, be it noted, at the very crisis of all ecclesiastical history in Scotland!] . . . I neither can nor will think that our Sovereign will let all this country be oppressed wrongously by subjects but I will not judge till I see the uttermost.

The letter ends with a courageous refusal to sign the Articles of Religion and it cannot be denied that the Archbishop fulfilled his word. He was steadfast to the last.

But why was no Catholic rejoinder prepared to the Protestant manifesto? Why did the Bishops pin all their trust to a foreign emissary, a certain John Monluc, Bishop of Valence? Called a "plenipotentiary," he proved a broken reed. There was little trace of leadership even among the English Bishops; in Scotland there was none. They seemed fascinated at the approach of their extinction. As ever, the constitutional party with all its tradition and experience went down before the revolutionary; they were frustrated by the assembling of the Estates in August; this threw out all their constitutional plans of defence and it was beyond their wit to devise a counter-stroke and utterly beyond their power to execute it.

There was one hidden foe the Scottish Bishops had to fight; this was Cecil, most skilled of diplomats, and "King of England." It was largely the hand of an Englishman that overthrew the old order in Scotland—strangely allied to the fanatical Knox and an unscrupulous Baronage.

To complete this brief study of the behaviour of the Catholic Bishops it must suffice here to take the evidence of the Papal legate, Nicolas de Gouda of the Society of Jesus, who reached Scotland in 1561; and finally to summarize what little is known about the further activities of the faithful Bishops after the crisis of 1560.

Soon after Mary Queen of Scots had succeeded to her impossible task and reached Scotland, the Pope sent his

own legate to guide and assist her cause and to get into touch, if he could, with her shattered Hierarchy. The legate represents in his own person the long and tenacious arm of the Counter-Reformation, but alas, he could effect little. He was the new type of missionary, evolved under God's divine Providence for His Church and stands in effective contrast to the older type of Bishop; he formed a very low opinion of their zeal and the suitability of their characters—at any rate in a time of crisis.

The Legate was under orders to deliver into the hands of the Bishops certain letters from the Pope. But the attitude of the Reformers was so menacing that the Bishops dared not meet the Legate. The Bishop of Ross, for instance, Henry Sinclair, said it would involve himself and all his household in peril of their lives. The Legate next approached the Bishop of Dunblane, William Chisholm, then in Edinburgh, to be met with the same reply—"non possumus." Personal interviews having failed the Legate tried correspondence and this elicited replies from the Archbishop and from the Bishops of Dunkeld and Aberdeen. Eventually he secured a single interview, with Dunkeld. He came disguised as a banker's clerk to the Bishop's board and they supped together in momentary alarm of detection. The Legate concludes this part of his letter by saying:

Your Reverence will be at no loss to gather from these particulars how far the cause of religion is likely to be advanced by negotiation with these good men.

However the Legate was quite alive to the extraordinary difficulty of their position and notes that the Bishop of Dunkeld was impeached for attempting to carry out his pastoral duties at Easter. He adds these damning words:

I will not describe the way in which these prelates live, the example they set or the sort of men they nominate as their successors; only it is hardly surprising if God's flock is eaten up by wolves while such shepherds have charge of it.

Yet there was an aftermath to this gloomy period; and to put the whole matter in a truer perspective we will conclude this sketch by a brief reference to the last testimony of the faithful Bishops during the chequered years of Mary's reign in Scotland; their personal characters and the last feeble functionings of the Hierarchy.

For the Hierarchy did not actually disappear as in

England, where it was deprived and imprisoned; in Scotland, owing to the fact that the Crown was Catholic and that the Bishops had their temporalities for life^a and were even called on at times to take part in official action, it was a process of gradual dissolution. Further, there were a few fresh episcopal appointments after the Suppression; among them that of the celebrated Bishop of Ross, John Leslie, who succeeded Henry Sinclair in 1566 and died about thirty years later.

First, then, a word as to the Primate, John Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 1549-1571. After serving the Crown as best he could he was declared a traitor as the result of the battle of Langside. Eventually he fell into the hands of Lennox and was hanged publicly on a gibbet in the town of Stirling on April 1st, 1571. Was he a martyr? Certainly he died as a Catholic for his faith, but how far he was also guilty of complicity in State plots is now almost impossible to determine; the Reformers, of course, brought many grave charges against him. On the whole he seems to have been a wise and determined prelate; no great leader in the hour of crisis but dogged to the end. His private life was irregular and his action in dissolving the marriage of Bothwell and his wife discreditable. The character of the Archbishop seems to have been moulded in that worldly epoch that produced a Wolsey in England; yet there were many elements of dignity and true spirituality about him and he suffered his end manfully.

William Chisholm, Bishop of Dunblane, 1527-1564, was described by Knox as one of the pillars of the Papistical Church; another faithful servant of the Crown, driven at last into exile. He became Bishop of Vaison and died a Carthusian in 1585 at Grenoble.

Patrick Hepburn, Bishop of Moray, 1535-1573. He too died a Catholic and kept possession of his episcopal palace until his death which occurred at Spynie Castle. His life was mainly spent in an endeavour to conserve his temporalities; as a spiritual influence he was of no great importance.

Robert Creighton, Bishop of Dunkeld, 1552-1586, suffered deprivation at the hands of the Reformers. He was a man of very high character and was eventually

^a In theory; but they were liable to constant spoliation.

restored to a small portion of his temporalities. Certainly a Confessor for the Faith.

The remainder of the old Catholic Bishops³ played no decisive part; some were purely worldly; some were never more than Bishop-elect and two, as we have seen, joined the Reformers and were snubbed for their pains.

Meanwhile, the Catholic protagonist among the Bishops was the lately appointed and noble Bishop of Ross, whose long and varied life does not fall within the scope of this essay.

So at least the old Hierarchy passed; a stormy sunset lit with some rays of stedfast glory, darkening as the reign of Mary progressed. But the Catholic Church did not pass; never for a day in Scotland was the Faith extinct. Under the long hammer blows of persecution the true Religion endured, supported by new missionaries and in time Vicars Apostolic with episcopal office. And at last a new diocesan Hierarchy was set up, for the tie had never been snapped between Scotland and the Holy See. The first official act of Pope Leo XIII was the Bull by which the Scottish Hierarchy was again established.

³ i.e., of those still left in Scotland.

WOMEN AND CATHOLIC ACTION

By BARBARA GRANT JOHNSON.

THERE has been so much controversy concerning the position of women in Catholic Action that in this, as in every subject of importance, it is easier to obtain enthusiastic support for either extreme opinion than to preserve the truth that lies in both. Most of the heresies that arose during the early days of the Church came about from over-stressing one aspect of the dogma concerned, and thus losing sight of the other. In the same way, to conclude either that women should take no part in any activity outside their own homes or that they should leave their homes in order to be of service to their neighbour, would be, in each case, an exaggeration. As might be expected, the ideal lies somewhere between the two opinions.

But, in spite of this fact, it must be insisted that the family is antecedent in institution and in importance to the State, and that therefore it is futile to try to reform the State before re-forming the family. Since this is so, it is obvious that Catholic Action must begin in the home. Now this is doubly important when talking of Catholic women, because it is the woman who makes the home. The husband is indeed the breadwinner, but she is the *housewife*.

In the ordinary course of events, it is the Catholic home that will produce the Catholic State and the recent lament concerning the very few Catholic men who are taking part in public affairs must be mainly attributable to the scarcity of Catholic homes and families. It is useless for women to fill up the gaps in the ranks of the men, if they do not also remember that the efficient Catholicity of the future generation depends upon them. This must be stressed even more in England than in other countries, for here the Catholic family is still the exception rather than the rule. Our young women do not realize some of the more subtle difficulties of a mixed marriage when they rush into them so heedlessly. I do not hesitate to say that, at least in this country, to make a good Catholic marriage is one of the best ways in which to promote the conversion of England. It is idle to imagine that it is possible to bring up children in a really Catholic atmosphere when one of the parents either regards Catholic customs and practices as so much foolery or merely tolerates them because they have,

apparently, a good effect upon the children. And it is much more important that the mother should be a Catholic than that the father should be one, for it is the wife and the mother who makes the home. Both by reason of time and circumstance, it is the mother who has most to do with the early training of the children, that early training which will count for so much in later years.

In addition to the deposit of faith, the Catholic Church passes on to her children a culture that has developed from centuries of Catholic living, of Catholic thinking. For generations the faith has had a refining influence on European culture and has absorbed that culture into itself by imbuing secular conventions with the spirit of Christian charity. It has often been remarked that Catholic children in an elementary school, with every circumstance against them in the way of coarse and poverty-stricken surroundings, have a greater sense of refinement than non-Catholic children of similar circumstances. This is due to the great Catholic tradition of centuries; due to the Mystical Body of Christ which must, as a whole, act with all that courteous charity with which our Blessed Lord was endowed as God and as God made Man. The more intensely we participate in the life of the Mystical Body, the more we and our children will find it impossible to act in other than a Christ-like manner. Now the home that either neglects or despises to model itself upon the little house at Nazareth, cannot hope to follow Christ in His public ministry. The home wherein the sacramentals of the Church are despised runs great risk of gradually forsaking her sacraments. Children are especially receptive of external aids to devotion, and in a house which lacks a statue of our Lady or a holy picture on the wall, they will find it hard to realize the intimate and personal treasure of the Faith.

The fostering of the right attitude to the Church which expresses itself in the adoption of her customs will normally fall to the duty of the woman in the home, and we have not lost sight of the fact that the atmosphere of the home will be the atmosphere of the State. Our children will not remember much of what we say to them, but they will remember what we *do*. They will remember the care with which their mother kept the lamp burning in front of the statue of the Sacred Heart

and the tenderness with which she knitted woollies for the children next door whose father had been out of work for over a year. Long after the memory of scoldings has passed away, our sons will remember the manner in which the servant was treated in their own home, and they in turn will give their employees a living wage.

Again, in connection with our home and family life, we have a very strong duty to our men-folk. It is our job to make men of them, not to unmake them. Eve was given to Adam to be his helpmate and, in actual fact, was his inspiration, but to evil. We must be the inspiration of our husbands, sons and brothers, but to good.

But if our Catholic Action is to begin in the home, it must just as surely continue outside the home. It must radiate in ever-widening circles and its influence must be felt by every person with whom we come in contact. As there is to be a special article on the spiritual impulse of Catholic Action, I do not wish to try to elaborate the subject here. But as Catholic Action for women must base itself even more particularly on their normal lives, it is necessary to realize that action that is Catholic must flow from and be the expression of a life that is Catholic, and a Catholic life is one in which everything we do is related to our Catholicity, not merely by the principle of *operatio sequitur esse*, but also by our knowledge of Catholic principles and their application to our everyday circumstances. For this a certain amount of study is essential, and until special classes are formed to teach us the Catholic principles of social life, we can learn a great deal by a careful study of the Encyclicals. In these the Holy Father tells us what is expected of us as Catholics in connection with our normal activities, how we should behave in the matter of dress, entertainment and what is the Catholic standard of modesty.

The recent Encyclical on the cinema should be read by every Catholic woman in the country. Women have a very important part to play in the world of entertainment and it is well to realize from the first that recreation is not only necessary for us as individual men and women but that, taken in the right way, it adds very considerably to the well-being of the community in general. The Holy Father recognizes that the

cinema, like every other modern invention which does not detract essentially from the dignity of man, can be an immense power for good. It is fairly obvious that the standard of entertainment offered to the community will depend upon the standard demanded by the women. This is especially true of the cinema and the theatre because the majority of their patrons are women, and if we refused to be taken to theatres where the standard of entertainment did not conform to Catholic principles, those theatres would soon be obliged to revise their policy in order to avoid bankruptcy. I do wish to point out that there would be something very wrong with our logic if we took a prominent part in organized Catholic activity at the instigation of the Hierarchy while, at the same time, we tolerated indecent plays and books condemned by the Hierarchy and read with a certain amount of enjoyment the accounts of divorce proceedings which appear in the secular Press.

While insisting upon the fact that home and family life has always the prior claim to our care, we must, at the same time, realize that for many women of the present generation a home is an impossible luxury. There are girls whose parents have died, whose brothers and sisters are married or who cannot find employment in their home-town, and who have therefore no rights and duties connected with their home. There are widows and many women who are not likely to get married owing to economic or other circumstances, but who do not feel the call to a religious life. To many of these we may justly look to defend our Catholic principles on the public platform and among our non-Catholic friends. There is a vast field of activity, for women have been admitted into almost every department of life and their influence can be brought to bear in the administration of many important positions hitherto filled only by men. It is questionable, however, whether women are not wasting their time by striving for equality with men in every position of life. There are, of course, notable exceptions. Occasionally, one woman has achieved success and influence which few men in the same circumstances would have reached. But these exceptions are rare and hardly justify the proportionate waste of misplaced talent. By our nature we have duties which differ from those incumbent on men, and we have been given the power and capability to perform these

duties, so that it is idle to compare our achievements with those of men. To set out the capabilities of men and women in order to compare them to the advantage of either party is as stupid as to try to multiply one pound by one mark. It would, therefore, seem that even the part we must undoubtedly play in the social activity and government of the community should still be the one most suitable to our natural abilities. In the modern State this part is easily determined. To women God has given the particular privilege of child-bearing, and if there is to be any question of legislation in this matter, it is in defence of our Catholic principles that Catholic women should be to the fore.

It would be a topsy-turvy world where the women bore arms or occupied the chairs of philosophy while the men were left in charge of the crèches. But we should remember the Communist women of Russia and Spain, and when we can sit down and read with equanimity the account of the passing of laws on divorce, birth-control and sterilization, formulated by a body of men, we are not very far from such nonsensical behaviour. It is admittedly difficult to offer detailed constructive criticism on this point because organization which is excellent in theory often breaks down in practice, owing to the varying amount of time, ability and concentration possessed by individual workers. But if some of our prominent and undoubtedly intelligent Catholic women would set their minds to the examination of what ways and means of influencing public opinion on this question were possible in their own district, the present state of affairs would not long be tolerated. I am aware that valiant attempts have been and are being made, but I am making the suggestion for whatever it is worth, that if we are to take part in public life at all, we should use all our energies, at least primarily, in the fight for Catholic principles in those departments which are, above all, our responsibility. Nursing is one of the careers where Catholic women are badly needed. Catholic women in pre-natal clinics, in schools, on health boards (if there must be such things) and as matrons or sisters in public institutions, are essential if we are to exert any influence at all over our non-Catholic friends. We could look forward to the future with confidence if only we could be sure of winning this particular battle.

Apart from the participation in this public life which is, after all, only for those of us who feel inclined for such activity, there is an even greater task awaiting us at our very door, in our own parish. Until an official organization for Catholic Action becomes operative in this country, we must find out for ourselves the best method of working which will conform to the Holy Father's definition of Catholic Action, namely, the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy.

The first point to notice is that, for our efforts to be truly a *participation* in this apostolate, it is necessary that they should derive their authority from the Hierarchy. The parish priest is the delegate of the bishop, and we must be the delegates of the parish priest. He must know what we are doing and he must, at least indirectly, have *sent* us to do it. In almost every parish there is one or other society for women already established, but if there is none, or if they do not satisfy our zeal for apostolic work, we can at least go to our priest and offer him our services, not indefinitely, but definitely, for a certain period each week. The priest himself cannot possibly look after every Catholic in his parish to his own satisfaction, and still less can he do much about the larger proportion of souls outside his flock. And no priest can be satisfied until the message of Christian faith and hope and charity has been delivered to every man, woman, and child in every house in his district. This message cannot be delivered in the course of one or two visits, and it is often only after many months of weekly visits that the first words of our Holy Faith can be profitably spoken. Yet these visits are needed in order to obtain the confidence and the friendship of those visited. The women of the parish must help the priest in this work, first, because they can give more time to it; and, secondly, because by their very gentleness and tact, by their self-sacrifice and other womanly gifts, they are eminently suited to this type of apostolate.

Here might I make a little appeal to our priests for their continued patience? They may receive offers of help from some of us who are inexperienced, and who appear to be utterly incompetent, and it may seem to them to be hardly worth all the time and trouble necessary in

order to teach us how to visit, when they have so much else on hand. But in reality it will prove to be a short cut for, when some of us have once been schooled in the manner of visiting, they in turn can take others with them during their work, and soon the priest will find that much of the routine work that he has hitherto been forced to do himself will be taken off his hands, leaving him free to occupy himself, far more extensively than was previously possible, with his essentially priestly duties. Again, some of us are not suited to the delicate task of visitation, but there is usually something that even we could do, such as taking children across busy roads to the Catholic school or going round each week with the Catholic papers which so many people will buy when they find them being offered at their very doors in a friendly spirit and at a time when it is convenient to pay for them. Indeed, it is true of these days that the harvest is great and the labourers few, and the real need is for a devoted band of lay men and women ready to do anything great or small at the request of the priest, and to offer themselves for this purpose.

In point of fact, there is at present a society in existence which seems ideal for this type of apostolate. It has already given an outlet to the zeal of many thousands of women and has developed the apostolic spirit in many more. I refer to the Legion of Mary. Actually it exists for men as well as for women, but pending the arrival of the official scheme for Catholic Action, promulgated by the Hierarchy, it is easier for the priest to work with one society than with isolated individuals, and the Legion is almost unique in that it admits all ages and classes of women, and safeguards their work by organized discipline and an orderly method of procedure. Moreover, its aim, after the sanctification of its members, is simply to extend the Kingdom of God upon earth, and yet it is saved from indeterminate action by requiring from each Legionary at least one hour's active work during the week. This insures that the work be done, while, at the same time, leaving the nature of the work to be determined by the priest and the needs of the district. Nothing is too small—or too great—for Legionaries to do, for they measure the perfection of their membership not by the nature or the results of the work allotted to them, but by the intensity of their adherence to the Legion spirit and rules.

In mentioning the Legion of Mary I am not in any way depreciating the excellence and the utility of other societies, for the needs of our age are too great to admit of any such pettiness in our own camp. We want good work done wherever and by whomsoever possible. At the same time the Legion is undoubtedly well suited to our Catholic women and girls, and it is not by chance that it has found itself in accordance with every pronouncement of the Holy Father on Catholic Action.

Women hold the key to Catholic Action in the home and for the future generation. In the little martyrdom of every-day life they need intensity of purpose and the spirit of the strong woman laughing in the face of death. I am not going to apologize for quoting the last chapter of Proverbs, for we need advice and inspiration and no better incentive to Catholic Action has ever been written. May these words ever ring in our ears and be engraved upon the memory of our children.

Who shall find a valiant woman? far and from the uttermost coasts is the price of her.

The heart of her husband trusteth in her, and he shall have no need of spoils.

She will render him good and not evil all the days of her life. . . .

She hath tasted and seen that her traffic is good: her lamp shall not be put out in the night.

She hath put out her hand to strong things, and her fingers have taken hold of the spindle.

She hath opened her hand to the needy, and stretched out her hand to the poor.

She shall not fear for her house in the cold of snow: for all her domestics are clothed with double garments. . . .

Strength and beauty are her clothing, and she shall laugh in the latter day.

She hath opened her mouth to wisdom, and the lay of clemency is on her tongue.

She hath looked well to the paths of her house and hath not eaten her bread idle.

Her children rose up and called her blessed: her husband, and he praised her.

Many daughters have gathered together riches: thou hast surpassed them all.

Favour is deceitful, and beauty is vain: the woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised.

Give her the fruit of her hands: and let her works praise her in the gates.

—PROVERBS XXXI.

A PLEA FOR ARCHITECTURE

BY THE REV. B. V. MILLER, D.D.

OUR seminaries already teach a multitude of subjects. There are many, and not among the students only, who think that the syllabus is greatly overloaded. Indeed, when we consider the claims of the purely professional subjects, of philosophy, moral and dogmatic theology, scripture, canon law, church history, music, liturgy and the rest, and when we remember that the average student is not a man of outstanding ability and quickness, we may well wonder how he can find the time and the energy necessary for membership of the many societies that are a common feature of seminary life, and for all the activities that help to make his course, not only bearable but happy and enjoyable. In almost any seminary or theological college you are almost certain to find a debating society—sometimes two—a literary society, a musical society and an orchestra, and two or three other societies with more or less fancy names. Then there will be a branch of the C.E.G., another of the C.S.G., the preparation of the college magazine, and the getting up of concerts and plays. All these things mean much time and work. In fact, after a fairly long experience, I am convinced that, as a type of the long-suffering and good-natured beast of burden (in no other way, of course), the seminarian can easily give points to the donkey.

Yet, in spite of all this, I am going to plead for still another addition to his burdens, to wit, the study of ecclesiastical architecture.

In view of what I have said I must, first of all, show that I am not trying to put upon the student's sorely tried back the last straw that would break it, that I am not asking that his already heavy load should be unduly increased. My plea is not for any very deep or intricate study of this subject. A good working acquaintance with its elements would be all that is necessary; and for this, half an hour's lecture, not once a week, but once a month, would amply suffice, and would, I am sure, be easily managed. Those responsible for the arrangement of the curriculum are usually

men of experience and of some ingenuity, who would not find it beyond their wit to fit in this monthly half-hour without any serious or, indeed, any appreciable disturbance of the present course of studies.

Such a small amount of time would, as I have said, be quite enough. Given a good lecturer who knows and is interested in his work, much knowledge can be imparted in thirty minutes. In two or three months the student would know how to distinguish between Saxon and Norman and Transitional, Early English and Geometrical, Decorated and Perpendicular; and he would know the approximate dates of each style. At the end of the three or four years that the course would last, he would know a good deal about the differences of the plans of parish, monastic and cathedral churches, of those of Benedictines, Cistercians, Dominicans and the rest; a good deal about piers and columns, capitals and bases, tracery, mouldings, roofs, rood-screens, buttresses, low side windows and squints, tombs and effigies, and all the numerous features that go to the building and adornment, and add to the interest of the pre-Reformation church. He would no longer be at the mercy of the country sexton who points with pride to the "leopard" window, or explains that the sixteenth century effigy on a tomb must represent a crusader because the legs are crossed. And, unless he were quite deaf to the call of the past and blind to the appeal of beauty, he would by now be eager to carry his studies farther, to buy the books that would take him deeper, and to travel, both at home and abroad, in order to see and enjoy the great buildings of the world. If I have made my point that such a study of church architecture, sufficiently complete in itself, could easily be included in the seminary course without any undue disarrangement, and without putting upon the student any grievous additional burden, it remains to justify the plea that this subject should have its place in the curriculum. This should be easy.

In the first place, to begin with what is, perhaps, the lowest in the list of advantages, some knowledge of church architecture will add immensely to the enjoyment of the student's walks and rambles, both during term time and during the holidays. It is safe to say that nearly every village church in England is worthy of study. With but few exceptions they all date from

pre-Reformation days, and, in spite of the wave of ill-informed and misdirected restoration that swept the country in the nineteenth century, when so much of beauty and interest was destroyed, the amount that remains is astounding, and nine churches out of ten are not only beautiful in themselves, but are documents in stone from which we may read much of the past. Every district is full of such churches, and now that the use of the bicycle is so wisely allowed in our seminaries, the student has a wide field of exploration and enjoyment before him. Taking the country round Oscott, with which I am best acquainted, and speaking quite off-hand and from memory, I should say that, although one side is largely blocked by Birmingham, there are within an easy day's ride at least twenty-five or thirty old churches well worthy of careful study. All those with any experience will agree that the pleasure of a ride or excursion is enormously increased if we can give a little specialized knowledge to the inspection of one or more of these monuments. A hobby of this kind, formed in student days, is not likely to die. Rather will it grow stronger as the passing years bring wider opportunities and added knowledge, and the priest's life will be enriched by many an hour of healthy and profitable pleasure.

Another advantage of this study is its apologetic value. Most people are agreed that one of the things most to be desired, if the conversion of England is to progress as we wish, is that the English people should be disabused of their absurd but deep-seated idea that Catholicism is something essentially foreign, and that they should be brought to see that it was the very life of England for nearly a thousand years. To this end some knowledge of church architecture is a great help. It is an eye-opener to many, especially country folk—I speak from experience—simply to be told that their fine village church was built as the home, and for the worship of the Blessed Sacrament; but the impression thus made can be greatly deepened if we can point out the Catholic use of many of its features; if we can show the cross incised altar slab, that was afterwards laid in the threshold for folk to walk on; if we can explain the purpose of the squints and the low side window, the meaning of the aumbry and the piscina, the holy water stoup

and the remaining wall paintings; if we can unfold the symbolism of the figures carved on the font, if from these and many other things we can make it quite clear that this was meant to be, and, for hundreds of years, was in fact, a Catholic building, devoted to solely Catholic uses, and now usurped by a new and alien religion.

Finally, a knowledge of architecture would be helpful for the future. Since it would entail a knowledge of the liturgical purpose of each architectural feature, of the history of native architectural development, and, almost inevitably, a fair acquaintance with liturgical requirements, it would save us from many repetitions of the monstrosities that have too often marked the course of the Catholic revival. The beauty and fitness and the appeal of our future Catholic churches depend largely upon our priests, and the priest who knows something of architecture and all that it implies will, when he comes to build, do far more for the glory of God and the conversion of England than he who is ignorant in such matters.

As far as beauty is concerned, little needs to be said. A visit to one of the many churches, put up some years ago in what a humorous prelate called the "early English workhouse" style, will convince anyone of the truth of what has been said. It were better not to specify these churches, as to which it may be urged in palliation that cheapness and speed of erection were great considerations; but even so there is no real excuse for their ugliness, and, in any case, the same sort of thing is all too common.

In considering the fitness of a building, the knowledge to be gained from a study of English architecture, of materials and sites, of local peculiarities and variations, of plans and special requirements, would be of great service to the priest-builder. Thus equipped, he would not plan his parish church—or allow the architect so to plan it—as if it were a Cistercian abbey, he would not use brick where everything calls for stone, or put up a lofty tower where the site demands a squat one, or make no provision for a baptistery, or allow an altar and reredos fit only to be a flower-stand, or commit any of the architectural and liturgical crimes that disfigure so many of our churches. The matter of appeal, to wit, the appeal to the outsider, to the non-Catholic English-

man, though of considerable importance, is too often forgotten. Some time ago I heard a priest boasting of the church that he had built as the gem of the diocese. He had commissioned the architect to build a typical Italian village church, and the result was perfection, the admiration and envy of all. The deed was done and argument, therefore, was useless, but I could not help asking myself what sort of appeal such a building would make to the ordinary non-Catholic beholder. No doubt it would suit an Italian village, but in the English scene it seems out of place. I can imagine the local clergyman pointing to it as further evidence of the "Italian mission," even though the priest's name might have been Smith—which it was not. I know of a small sea-side town where the new Catholic church, a somewhat handsome building, is notable for the Irish treatment of Gothic and for its belfry built as an Irish round tower: excellent things, of course, in their right place, but are they calculated to help or to hinder, of themselves, the conversion of England? Do they make any appeal to the passer-by, do they help him to realize that the Catholic Church has been at home in England for hundreds of years, and is not a foreign importation of recent times?

Since my argument might seem to reflect upon those who built Westminster Cathedral, it may be added that, although the decision was in favour of a Byzantine church, this decision was not made hastily, but was come to only after the problem of building in the English style had been fully considered.

This matter of the appeal of what is local and native is surely one that should always be taken into account whenever a new church is to be put up.

But I hope that I have said enough to make good my plea for a proper study of church architecture in all our seminaries and theological colleges.

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. R. H. J. STEUART, S.J.

First Sunday of January. Feast of the Holy Name.

St. Luke xi. 21.

This feast, like a number of others now established in our Liturgy, was the outcome of the personal devotion of a saint, St. Bernadine of Siena, with whom may be associated St. John Capistran a fellow Franciscan, also of the fifteenth century. Like many other devotions, too, it was at first opposed upon theological grounds: in this case, perhaps, fundamentally if not specifically, in protest against what one might call the tendency (not unknown in our own day) to "dissect" Christ, with an accompanying risk to the clear comprehension of His indivisible personality. It was not until more than three centuries later, in 1721, that Pope Innocent XIII, yielding to the petition of the Emperor Charles VI, sanctioned the Mass and Office of the Holy Name of Jesus and appointed it to be celebrated yearly by the universal Church at the beginning of the month of January.

Among primitive races a name was much more than a convenient sign of numerical distinction between individuals. It was intended to express the essence of its possessor's individuality: it was a sacred and secret thing, never used in ordinary circumstances, for which occasions a secondary name (a "nick"-name) was substituted. One sees some reference to this usage in certain passages of the Apocalypse (cf. Apoc. ii. 17 and xix. 12). In the time of our Lord, however, this custom must have been practically extinct: one remembers that the objection raised by the friends of Zachary and Elizabeth to the name of John for their son was only that no one of their kindred had borne it (Luke i. 61). But that a good deal of importance was still attached to the aptness of proper names is implied, for instance, by the changes imposed upon Simon, Levi, and Nathanael. In the cases both of our Lord and of the Baptist, however, their names were bestowed upon them by the direct command of God (Luke i. 12 and 31), and one is obliged to see in them a peculiar appropriateness to their respective offices and personalities.

John (Joannes) is an abbreviated form of the Hebrew "Jehochanan" ("the Gift of God"). He was the Messenger given to Israel, as foretold by the prophet Malachy, to prepare the way for the Messias: the "burning and shining light," but not the Light itself, who was to lead His people to that "True Light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world" (John i. 9). Verses 23 to 36 of the third chapter of

St. John's Gospel contain the Baptist's own explicit declaration concerning his mission and the justification of the prophecy.

To render the name Jesus as "Saviour" is rather to paraphrase than to translate it. Literally it should mean "The Lord is salvation." It is, however, obvious that "Saviour" is here the actual personal significance, and as such it has always been interpreted by the Church. It is probably only an accident that etymologically, in its Greek form "Iesous," it might derive from a verb meaning "to heal."

But our concern here is with the significance of the Holy Name for us to-day, and we find that concisely stated by St. Peter, in the fourth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in his answer to the charge of the High Priest: "There is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved."

It is His name who, justifying His claims by His works, declared Himself to be "*the way and the truth and the life*," "the door," "the vine": who said that he who sees Him sees the Father to Whom no one can come but by Him. Words could not be more explicit or more urgent. Such claims, or anything remotely like them, no man has ever dared to make before or since for no man could do so without by ineluctable inference proclaiming too his own divinity. It is not, therefore, as a prophet alone or a teacher of truth that Christ presents Himself to us, but as the Truth itself, speaking and commanding our attention with an authority not derived but absolute.

In the feast of the Holy Name—the Signature of the New Covenant—we are reminded of the sure foundation of our Faith and stimulated to a renewal of unlimited trust and confidence in Him who bore it. And since it was the name of a man, it reminds us, too, of all the consequences of that transcendent mystery, God's entry into the life of man, sharing as His own in all its detail—effort, suffering, failure, temptation, death—so that the immeasurable distance between ourselves and God, the thought of which so easily tends to stiffen and formalize and impede our personal relations with Him, seems to disappear as we find Him still His own infinite self yet actually moving upon our own level. Left to ourselves, alone with what our reason would teach us of the nature of God, we are paralyzed by the implications of His immensity, eternity, immutability. We should hardly dare to hope: still less to pray: scarcely to believe that we and our trivial matters could be of any concern to Him. But that name recalls to us that in the Man Jesus we have the very God whom we worship translated, as it were, but without abating His Godhood, into our own mode of being: and seeing Him thus pleased or angered, loving less or loving more, moved by prayer (as in the case of the Syro-Phenician woman) to what looks like a change of mind, we come to understand that though in this life the mystery of how it is can never be penetrated, we are yet right in regarding and approaching Him as though He really were one of ourselves. But further still. The name Jesus should put us in mind of the wonder of that

mystical incorporation with Him upon which is grounded our supernatural life and our adoptive sonship wherein repose the whole hope and possibility of our salvation.

"I live," says St. Paul, "now not I, but Christ liveth in me." I am (he would say), as God sees me, supernaturally alive or not alive according as looking at me He sees or does not see Christ in and as me. For there is now, as we may put it, but one Just Man before God, Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord. In Him the whole race of the saved is unified and absorbed. Its members do not lose their identity among themselves nor in Him: but, as the saved, their very identity consists in their oneness with Him, for such they are only because of that. "Put ye on therefore," says St. Paul again: "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." By our oneness with Him, achieved through Baptism—our *Christ*-ening—there is actually, not just metaphorically, ingrafted in us the germ of the Christ-life to be tended and brought to maturity by our own free action. If we take literally St. Paul's image of "putting on," it will mean our trying to see through the eyes of Christ, to look upon God and our fellow-men and all the world beside as He did: it will mean our trying to use our minds and imaginations as He used His, or at least not in any way that we know He could not have used them: it will mean placing our affections where He placed His and shaping our activities upon His.

The text-book to this Science is the Gospel of which the Church is the custodian and the divinely appointed exponent: and through the earnest study of this (with prayer helping) not only the words and works of Christ, but His very thoughts and ideals, become more and more our possession and more and more attractive to the best that is in us.

The two disciples at Emmaus begged our Lord, even before they recognized Him, not to pass on but to remain with them, their hearts had so burned within them as He opened the Scriptures to them in the way; and indeed it is the property of the Gospel to stimulate even while it satisfies the appetite of him who studies it in this spirit, for it is the Book of Jesus of whom "Who taste Thee," says St. Bernard, "hunger yet: who drink of Thee still thirst."

Second Sunday of January. Feast of the Holy Family.

In the view of the Church it is the family, rather than the individual, that is the basic unity of society, and it is for the protection and benefit of the family that, in the first place, the social scheme of law and order is established. Where Christianity is professed as at least the formal framework of civilization, this philosophy is also more or less accepted according as that profession is more or less sincere. But where, as for instance, under Bolshevism or Communism, Christianity is entirely and violently rejected, we see the State encroaching upon and even

superseding the family and claiming the sole and supreme right in the upbringing and government of the individual.

Hence it is, too, that (other reasons apart) the Church opposes divorce, birth control, free love, sterilization, and all similar practices approved by the pseudo-science of Eugenics which, by an inversion of the right order, concerns itself primarily with the good (and, in the first place, with the physical good) of the individual regarded primarily as a "State-asset," and only derivatively with the family. But the family represents the divinely appointed consummation of human life, in which the two sexes find their natural and mutual complement. Virginity, so highly esteemed and praised in the Scriptures and by the Church, is no derogation from this principle since, for one thing, no one is compelled to exercise all the rights and powers which he possesses if these are not essential to salvation. And indeed the right of voluntary renunciation of personal rights for a worthy purpose—the more worthy if it aim at higher spiritual good—is at the foundation of Christian liberty. In any case, those who whether of their free will or by force of circumstances pass their lives in what we call the single state, always have been and always will be historically a minority, so that the familiar argument against the Catholic laudation of virginity that logically it makes an ideal of race extinction, and is besides in direct opposition to the command of the Creator to "increase and multiply" (Gen. i. 48), comes within the scope of the Scholastic maxim *Ex absurda hypothesis sequitur absurdum*. "He that can take, let him take it," said our Lord on this very topic.

In his Brief *Neminem fugit* of June 14th, 1892, Leo XIII points out that at the very commencement of His work of reparation Christ sets us (as a first lesson, so to speak, in Christianity) the model of the perfect family. God made man exhibits Himself first as God made a child, subject to, helpless without, parental care and authority. That the Gospel narrative affords us but slight detail of His infancy and early youth is in fact no loss: "He was subject to them," "He advanced in wisdom and age and grace with God and man," are enough.

The teaching of the Church on the subject of the family and of the mutual rights and obligations of parents and children is the teaching of Christ Himself who is with her "all days even to the end of the world," guiding and informing her now through the Holy Spirit as He did personally while He lived upon earth, so that we know that her doctrine is in all matters the authoritative unfolding of His own. The Commandment (a bilateral precept) "honour thy father and thy mother," received at Nazareth an additional sanction and consecration from its observance by the very Son of God Himself, by His Immaculate Mother, and by Joseph the just man, her husband. But perhaps the special meaning of Nazareth as a practical issue for ourselves, particularly as including those of us for whom the duties of family life no longer exist as such or perhaps never did exist in

the fullest sense, lies specially in the deductions that we may draw from what it signified to the parents of Jesus.

What, for instance, did this intimate human association with God mean to Mary? He was to her, first, the most important thing in her life. Certainly, short of the relation between a creature and the Creator from whose will and choice he ceaselessly proceeds, there can be nothing closer between two beings than the bond of motherhood and sonship—flesh of her flesh, and more than that. Nothing can be nearer to a woman than her child, nothing so almost herself. Of all interests those of her child come first, and in him she finds the fulfilment of herself. What Mary, therefore, in the Holy Family of Nazareth stands for in the first place is a perpetual reminder of the right order of values in the Christian life, that God and the things of God come before all else under all circumstances, that we are never more fully our real selves than when we most completely give ourselves to serve Him, that those who would follow Christ truly may follow nothing else.

And again. In that Family the companionship of Christ was to her and to Joseph the most ordinary and most natural thing in their life. He was a part of it: they had not to turn away from anything in order to turn to Him. Sleeping, waking, working, resting, they were with Him and He with them in all of it, and it was all His as it was all theirs. They did "all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" because they did nothing but what He did too, nor anything but what was for Him. And what is this but another reminder of the harmony and oneness with God which, since He became one of ourselves, has in consequence come within the scope of the very simplest and most ordinary of our operations?

Once more: Nazareth shows us Mary having care of Christ and Christ in need of her care. It is no misstatement, or overstatement, to say that in a very real sense He is in our care too, and in need of it. To make Him known and loved, if not by active teaching at least by the no less fruitful apostolate of example and prayer, is a duty which no Christian may evade; and it is one of the implications of the Incarnation that God has in some ineffable way fettered His own Will, as it is manifested in this world, with the free action of ours. Else, why pray (as a petition for our own selves) that His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven?

In sum: Mary was His mother according to the flesh and reared and tended Him from babyhood to manhood, and from the shelter of His home and hers He went out to the fulfilment of His mission, from Nazareth to Calvary, with her still caring for Him at the end. There it was that she received the divine commission to be still His mother in the new risen life that He was to begin in us. For now we who are associated with Him in that supernatural life which He has brought us ("I am come that they may have life") are become mystically identified with Him, and as Mary was the mother of Jesus at Bethlehem and

Nazareth so she is still His mother, and therefore ours, as He lives now in and as each of us. And how much of her care is needed in that new Holy Family! It reaches us as we learn from what Christ was to her in Nazareth what He should be to us within ourselves—the first and central interest in our lives, familiar to us in all our doings and goings and comings, mysteriously dependent upon our good will for the accomplishment of that divine purpose for which He laid down His life, the realization on earth of the Kingdom of Heaven and the saving of all mankind. If we may not have to give our lives for that cause literally as He did, there yet rests upon us an inescapable responsibility for living, according to our opportunities, under the pressure of the same ideal. No one can give, says a philosophical maxim, what he does not possess. We cannot give Christ to the world as our Faith binds us to if He be not with us to give. What it means in daily life to have Him for the giving is learnt plainly from meditation on the Holy Family: and for help and enlightenment in that study where better can we seek but from her, the mother, by whose gentle authority it was ruled?

Third Sunday of January.

St. John ii. 1-11.

The Gospels record very few utterances of the mother of Christ, not more than half a dozen including the Magnificat. Being what she was, her part in the Incarnation was more by way of complete interior acceptance and acquiescence in the will of God than of any public action in conjunction with her Son, and one feels that her greatness is emphasized rather than obscured by the absence of any such outward signs of her transcendent dignity as according to worldly estimation should have accompanied it. Humility, the essence of which is a truthful valuation of oneself, neither overrating nor underrating, is the consequence of that clear vision of God's all-ness, and by comparison of man's utter nothingness, which inevitably follows upon what we call sanctity, and Mary claims for herself nothing higher or more precious than the lowliness of a handmaid even while acknowledging that God had done such great things in her that from thenceforth all generations should call her blessed. What else indeed should we expect in her whose Son, in whom dwelt "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9), was yet "despised and the most abject of men" in the midst of the world?

All the more reason, then, that we should pay attention to such of her words as are recorded, since we may take it for granted that there must be a special significance in these exceptions.

In the Gospel of to-day we do indeed find our expectation justified. Those words, "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye," share with her Son's in that prophetic and universal

application which makes of them truly words of life, for we should never forget that in all the acts and sayings of Christ He was reaching out over the shoulders, as it were, of the circle of His immediate witnesses to that uncountable legion yet to come of those that should believe in Him.

Had she really been rebuked by her Son when first she drew His attention to the failure of the wine? "Woman, what is that to me and to thee?"—was He really finding fault with her?

There seems to be little profit in straining after an interpretation of these words which should give them a meaning here that one would not think of ascribing to them in any other context. But is it not a matter of common experience among ourselves that expressions, very much harsher than these appear to be, may quite change their import with the tone in which they are uttered? It may be, therefore, that these words of our Lord's meant no more than that the matter was one in which He and His mother had, as guests at the feast, no title to intervene without invitation: and hers to the waiters have been a response to their (perhaps mute) appeal to Him to do so. One may see some sort of parallel to this apparent change of mind in the incident of the woman of Canaan related by St. Matthew xv. 27 and St. Mark vii. 24.

However, what concerns us here is not a point of exegesis but what we have called the prophetic and universal application of Mary's words. "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye." How many terribly hard sayings that includes! What would it mean literally to live the Christ-life as He by word and example has so unequivocally laid it down! Imagination staggers at the picture of the Sermon on the Mount really and effectively governing the lives of all men. Could it be done at less cost than the constant and willing endurance of pain and poverty and injustice and loss and the unremitting practice of forgiveness and loyalty and love—what courage, what faith, what spirituality and self-suppression and trust! How many of the principles and conventions, tacit or avowed, by which we live would survive under such a discipline? To put it bluntly, what sort of a life, from the everyday point of view, should we have?

To answer such queries we must first ask ourselves whether we really can believe that He who by becoming man has assured us more convincingly than any words could do that He knows all our strength and all our weakness from the inside, as it were, could have prescribed to all of us a task that would tax the endurance of the very best amongst us; and again, whether He to whom the Gospel applies the words of Isaiah (xlii. 3) "the bruised reed He shall not break, the smoking flax He shall not quench," betokening the gentleness and forbearance of His dealing with the souls of men, could be so exacting over our performance as such reflections would seem to make Him?

But what if that programme of the Christian life be set before us as the ideal towards which we should work rather than as a directory to be followed literally and all at once, and that it

have, in its degree, much the same connotation as has the monition (which, indeed, occurs in the same context) "Be you therefore perfect as also your heavenly Father is perfect"—a term placed far beyond the scope of our utmost possible endeavour and by that very fact warning us that no point of perfection to which we attain may be regarded as the limit of the excellence required of us? We shall not then be discouraged but rather stimulated by its sublimity, and we shall come to realize that the value in the eyes of God of any virtue that we possess is not the virtue in itself but the index that it affords of our effort to acquire it as something that represents the will of God in our regard. What I have to show as a result may be but a poor thing in itself but a very great and noble thing in what it stands for. For I am successful in God's eyes not because in the end I have done what I tried to do, but because up to the end I have never ceased from trying to do it. The essential point is that we should do what we do for the main reason (whatever other motives there may be) that He has "said it" to us. His command, thus simply obeyed, transmutes our poor performance into something richer and finer than we could have believed—from water into wine.

So, too, we but waste our time and energy in seeking to know the "why" of what He calls upon us to undertake or in mourning the smallness of our opportunities or the limitations of our own powers. *Dominus est, quod vult faciat*: wine was wanted, and His command to the servants was to fill their jars with water. It was not they that furnished the wine but He, their obedience supplying through His divine power for the inadequacy of their own means and ability.

Mystically, this first of His miracles teaches what all of them repeat and reinforce, that God alone brings strength out of weakness, victory out of defeat, life out of death; that man's necessity is the opportunity of God's mercy; that often He will let things grow worse and our needs be felt more keenly just so that when He comes to our aid there may be in us a greater desire for the better things that He has in mind to give, a larger capacity for their reception, a heartier response to His love and liberality. The better wine comes later; the Incarnation after the long, bitter, waiting and wandering; and, at the last of all, when man has "well drunk of that which is worse," the *calix inebrians* whose surpassing excellence "eye hath not seen nor ear heard nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive."

Fourth Sunday of January.

St. Matthew viii. 1-13.

The earliest and most natural form of prayer is petition, and this is not wholly self-seeking but is also an act of worship, for to ask God for what we want is an explicit declaration of our belief that He can give us what we ask for—an acknowledgment, that is, of His sovereignty. No doubt the child and the primitive

man have in their minds anthropomorphic notions of God that limit their conception of His will and power to grant their petitions, which normally will be concerned with material objects only. Intellectual development in either case may therefore lead to a weakening of confidence in Him as the All-Father, and it is here that revealed religion comes to their aid and while spiritualizing their ideas about God and raising the level of their desires, reassures them at the same time of His attention to even the least and most ephemeral of their needs: "Ask and you shall receive," "Your Father knoweth that you have need of these things," but also, "Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice and all these things shall be added unto you." The motive behind all other motives in our petitions must be that the divine will shall be done in us: but it is no harm to the genuineness of this motive that we also desire for its own sake the thing for which we pray; only, we must be ready, no matter what the apparent evidence to the contrary, to accept the outcome, either way, of our prayer as not only a real answer but as the *right* answer to it.

The Church teaches that prayer is infallible, but she does not teach that every petition will be granted in the very form in which we cast it. The prayer that rises from our lips in the crude form of material or semi-material petition is, as it were, refined in the ears of God to its spiritual equivalent, which may or may not coincide with its original shape. As this, and according to the sincerity of our desire that His will may be done in our regard, it is *always* granted. We are the dearer to God—the holier—for it, whether or not the thing itself come to pass; and we can see, surely, even in the midst of our disappointment, that an answer to prayer which did not effect that would be worse than no answer. Even so, it may often be that the true reason of the apparent failure of prayer is that we made it without sufficient faith, hoping perhaps that it will be granted yet ready to be surprised if it be. Against this we have the reiterated exhortation of Christ to have faith without limit—not so much, we might say, to trust that God will hear us as to *know* that He will. It may be objected that this needs a higher level of spiritual perception than can fairly be expected of the average man. But wherein is the force of that objection? Only in the response that it meets with from that sort of "inferiority complex" which appears to be intractable to the treatment of Christ's plain teaching spoken and acted. There are many meanings that we may legitimately attribute to His works of mercy—the healing of the dumb and the blind and of the palsied and the leprous, and the raising of the dead—and one of these, surely, is that in them He wishes us to see illustrated the limitless range of His power and the readiness of His will to minister to every human necessity, even the most desperate: "believe for the very works' sake" (John xiv. 12).

In the Gospel of to-day we are presented with two types of response to this invitation of Christ's to trust without after-

thought in the benevolence of God. In the case of the leper no mistake or doubt was possible. At one moment he is an object of fear and loathing to others and a burden to himself, a living man infested with the corruption of the dead, and at the next he is sound and fresh and clean. He had no doubt that Christ *could* cleanse his rotting body, but *would* He?

The centurion is so certain from the very first that he makes no petition at all. He simply states his case and suggests no action nor even a word from Christ, until He Himself offers to come and heal the sick man. Even then he answers in deprecation of more than a word, and when that word is spoken he asks no further evidence. His certainty, though he had but Christ's assurance for it, was as great as the leper's whose every sense attested the granting of his prayer. It is to the centurion rather than to the leper that we should look for the ideal of "faith believing": the faith, namely, which not simply makes us hope, however stoutly, that our prayer will be heard, but which goes further even than seems reasonable and is certain that every prayer *is* granted, and is no stronger because of the evidence that indeed it is so. A faith, truly, which is fit to move mountains: a faith which nothing can surprise save, perhaps, the suggestion that anything could surprise it.

Is it, after all, anything out of the way that we should feel like this? The promise "Ask and you shall receive" means also, no doubt, that we shall not receive if we do not ask. But the Lord was well aware that the mixed audience whom He was addressing would in the first place take His words simply and literally as they heard them, yet He added no qualification of what He had said. Not here alone but in every department of religion we are, or should be, aware that our apprehension of spiritual things must always be after our own earthly mode and therefore be incomplete and faulty and even on occasion quite false. And this recollection should act as a corrective to the natural expectation (with its possibility of subsequent disappointment) that our petition should always be granted just as we voice it. But Christ taught us to approach God as children do their father, who know quite well that though he will not always give them the thing that they ask as they ask it, yet he will not give them less but more of his love just because they have asked. "Ask and you shall receive" *must* refer in the first place to "the things that are above," just as the intentions of a loving father towards his children must be directed in the first place to their real good of which as yet they may have no appreciation. When at last we see no longer as through a dim glass darkly but face to face, when we shall "know as we are known," we shall understand for the first time, what we could never understand now, how no prayer of ours to our Father in heaven was ever rejected nor ever remained unheard. We shall see how many a supposed refusal to which, perhaps, we had bowed with what grace we could, was in fact really a granting, perhaps with a fullness that we could never have expected or conceived—in

"measure heaped up and pressed down and overflowing." That true faith which Christ so emphatically and uncompromisingly demanded of us as the price of impetration is not simply, nor principally, faith that God will certainly hear and grant our prayer as it comes from us, but a habit of belief in His word of such high quality as "staggeres not" even when by all the canons of reason and commonsense it seems certain that He has not. This is not paradox, nor does it offer violence to reason. It is, on the contrary, a truly "reasonable service," being the nearest expression that our limited time-bound intellects can give of our confidence in God, eternal, infinite, transcendent.

Fifth Sunday of January.

St. Matthew viii. 23-27.

The Gospel of to-day is one which may well reveal "thoughts out of many hearts," for does it not suggest a vignette, as it were, of the condition of the world around us? On all sides we see Christianity attacked with, in many places, a ferocity that recalls the persecutions of the early centuries. That would not be so disquieting by itself, for now as then there have been many martyrs to testify that the life of the body is a small thing in the balance against the Truth, and we have seen once more verified the prophecy of Christ that the world would hate His followers as it had hated Him. What is disquieting, however, to many people is the spectacle of so much desertion of the Truth by those who cannot plead the excuse of violence. We are the spectators of a wholesale apostasy of individuals and families and nations. To those who refuse to accept the teaching of Christ are now added (and more and more with every day that passes) a new category of those who having once accepted now reject it; who claim to have proved it and to have found it wanting. In literature and science and art, in the press, in the policy of governments, Christianity is increasingly treated less even as a system not worth considering than as a fraud and an imposture which has been found out and exploded. It is enough to condemn a book, for instance, or at least to depreciate its value, that it has been written by a Catholic; and on the other hand, in any conflict between Catholic and opposing policies, interests, or principles, the presumption is invariably with the opposition. One need look no further back than to contemporary history for proof that the great public forces, those influences by which thought is moulded and action guided, are wholly hostile to the teaching of Christ as we of His one true Church hold and interpret it. The very approval (or at least the benevolent sufferance) which is accorded to Christian denominations outside the Church is but an additional weapon of attack. Apparently (they seem to say) there will be for at least a long time to come persons styling themselves Christians, let them be; if they are not Catholics (that is, Roman Catholics) our quarrel with them is a minor matter; indeed, they are useful to us, because the

offensive against the Catholic Church will be the more effective as it seems to be in reality in defence of a purer Christianity.

Well, this is by no means the first time that we have found ourselves under the ban of the culture which for the time being considered itself to stand for enlightened civilization, though it may perhaps be questioned whether the ban has ever before lain so heavily upon us. But it matters very little; in any case we expect not peace but the sword. What does matter, though, is the possible reaction upon our individual selves of this tremendous unanimity of condemnation which is thrust upon our consciousness at every turn. Is it possible that here and there the temptation may come upon one to wonder, in the face of that phenomenon, why Christ does not actively vindicate the truth of His Church, why in fact something does not happen, for all the world to see, which shall right us? And the further temptation, perhaps, to accept the situation as somehow inevitable and to act and speak, in consequence, almost in a deprecating and apologetic spirit? After all, must there not have been something of that sort at the root of the defections from the Faith of which we have been and still are the witnesses?

Experience, indeed bare logic, tells us that the favour of the world can never be accorded to Christ, for Truth is what the majority of mankind simply cannot stand. Our Lord Himself demanded of His judges to be told for what misdeeds they were about to judge Him, and they could not answer, because then they would have had to acknowledge that His high crime in their eyes was that He spoke the Truth. Experience tells us, too, that though might is not right it can very easily be made to look like it, and might is now wholly against Christ—"The Gentiles rage," and *nothing* happens!

This Gospel calls us back to our duty. It is a reminder, couched in terms of an acted parable, that however great the stress no matter how desperately wrong things seem to be, nothing—absolutely nothing—happens but under the control and at the will of God. The skein of the world's history is too tangled for us to unravel; for the many wrongs and contradictions of which we are the almost despairing witnesses we can find now no explanation; but the threads, none missing, are all in His hands: we must not doubt: all is well. "See," said our Lord to Mother Julian: "See! I am God! See! I do all things. See! I lift never my hands from my work! How can anything be amiss!"

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

In *Sense and Thought*, by Greta Hort,¹ we have a new study of the mysticism of the unknown English writer of the fourteenth century who wrote *The Cloud of Unknowing* and *The Epistle of Privy Counsel*. Miss Hort recognizes in the writer, as do all who have read him, a mystical genius of rare individuality. She devotes her study to him because she considers that he discovered by way of contemplation an escape from the mediæval traditional metaphysics in which he had been brought up and pointed the direction to the best modern thought on the nature of God and the method of attaining Him as He really is.

Let me say at once that she is clear and logical and has made a close study of her subject and of other mystical writers. But no Catholic critic could agree with her interpretation of *The Cloud*. If the work really teaches what she ascribes to it, it is not a work of Catholic mysticism. To her mind, the author of *The Cloud* believes that "neither God nor man exists apart from each other," "God and man are correlatives in being," "God is the Whole, all-inclusive and self-existent; but it is a Whole which consists of members, there is reciprocity and relation between each member and the Whole of which it is a part; and through the Whole all the members are one." The author freed himself from the traditional fatherly, retributive, distant God by discovering that his instincts had one goal towards which they may strive, and then focusing his entire being on that which is common to all the instincts. He thus began to find freedom from a thought-cleavage of subject thinking and object thought; he liberated a conative attitude, which gradually strengthened and enlarged and gathered into itself more and more of the self of the mystic until it absorbed him entirely, and he came into "coherence with the whole which is eternal." The process liberated him completely from sin, for "goodness and badness as human qualities inherent in a self have no place in mysticism." It freed him from the sense of awe, because awe is a feeling called forth by a mysterium, which is felt as something greater than ourselves and outside us, threatening us, and hence can have no place when the mystic realizes this greatness as in some way connected with himself. Further, the process made the author reject bodily austerities, because "when he discovered that God will be loved by body and soul as seemly is, and reward them their need together, he would be effectively cured of all hankering after austerities."

¹ George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. pp. 262. 8s. 6d.

Catholic students who read *The Cloud* with an appreciation of Catholic theological tradition to guide them, become immediately aware of the fallacy of this interpretation. The author of that remarkable work was in no sense a pantheist. He was strongly Thomist from first to last, particularly in his doctrines of God, of grace and of charity as the essence of perfection. God to him was always transcendent, and there was no escaping from the sense of being a creature distinct from, and unworthy of, God. He discovered an intimacy with God in contemplation that he could not otherwise have attained; but he did not discover another God from the God of his childhood. In the exercise of contemplation he presupposes and acts upon Catholic principles; he knows not any other principles. He is in no sense different from St. Teresa or St. John of the Cross in the essence of his contemplative doctrine; he has indeed much in common, even in the details of his exposition, with St. John of the Cross.² There is nothing in Miss Hort's book about grace, of which *The Cloud* is so full; nothing about the Scriptural origin of the Divine Cloud or of its traditional meaning in mysticism; nothing adequate about the sense of awe and sinfulness that struck the greatest prophets and saints when they became aware of the presence of God and to which the author of *The Cloud* is alluding, as an inescapable fact and not as a false survival, when he speaks of "the lump of sin."

Among the recent spiritual books there are several which deal with the imitation of Christ. In fact, this very essential Christian subject, and the science of prayer, and the lives of founders of modern congregations are the subjects with which pens are most busy to-day. In books which set forth the example of Christ the doctrine of the Mystical Body can be used to give a new turn to old truths and to infuse a spirit of living warmth and love into what otherwise might be a catalogue of things to be shunned. *Branches of the Vine*, by the Rev. F. J. Mahoney, S.J.,³ is a warm book of this kind. Its plan is to apply the doctrine of the Mystical Body to the religious life. The earlier half of the book traces the development of the religious life as a growth of Christ dwelling in the soul; the later half sets out a scheme of prayer to assist the soul in developing the Christ life, with sample meditations on the chief feast or devotion of each month. It contains much good thinking; it is theological and full of earnest fervour. But unfortunately it seems to have been written *currente calamo* with the result that the deep thoughts are often entangled in tortuous sentences. Had the author applied his file patiently, he would have produced an altogether excellent book.

Le Sacrement de l'Unité, by F. Charmot, S.J.,⁴ is a very good

² Cf. a fine article on "The Excellence of *The Cloud*" in the *Downside Review*, January, 1934, by Dom David Knowles, O.S.B.

³ Bruce, Milwaukee, and Coldwell, London. pp. x., 157. 6s. 6d. A dear book for its size.

⁴ Desclée de Brouwer. pp. 336. 12 fr.

theological and devotional treatise on the central sacrament of the Mystical Body. Beginning with the sacrifices of the Old Law, the author shows how in them God was gradually realizing His plan of unity. In the New Law He has achieved this plan by uniting all the faithful in the priesthood and victimhood of Christ, and has spread by the Holy Sacrifice universally the royal virtue of charity. From the Holy Eucharist radiate elevated devotion and asceticism, an inspiring sense of Catholic unity and the only powerful stimulus to work for social justice among men.

Three other books deal with the example of Christ, but not so directly with the Mystical Body. *The Joy of Sorrow*, by David McAstoker, S.J.,⁵ brings quiet faith in the Passion to bear on the various ills that befall men. The author has been an invalid for many years and has taken up the apostolate of the pen with considerable fruit in his native country. His present book has the note of reality that comes from personal experience. *Promises of Christ*, by Mother Mary Philip, I.B.V.M.,⁶ is a book of meditative essays unfolding the various promises made by our Lord as recorded in the Gospels and the promises of Paray-le-Monial. In the Angelus we pray three times daily that we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ. What are these promises of Christ? This book catalogues them, and it would be interesting and useful, if it were merely an explanatory catalogue. But it is so much more. Under the text recording each promise are gathered numerous other apposite Scripture texts and incidents, with a personal application throughout, and a beautiful prayer (often from the liturgy) to conclude. Each essay is of about two pages in length, and could be conveniently used for meditation or expanded into a conference. The promises concern the Blessed Sacrament, faith, love, charity to others, prayer, the will of God, sacrifice of self, the religious life, the active life, the interior life, Heaven, the promise of fulfilment. The section on the interior life is the longest, and contains eighteen promises. Altogether, it is a most helpful devotional book, well stocked with material and written in a clear, pleasing manner.

Just before he died Cardinal Lépicier had completed the revised text of a series of ten conferences on the Lord's Prayer. They have now been published under the title, *Our Father*.⁷ The late Cardinal was an eminent theologian; but he was also, as not every learned theologian is, a man of very simple faith and piety. His learning and his piety have equally contributed to the composition of these careful conferences. In a short Foreword he sets out the purpose he had in publishing them. The *Our Father* is, "after the Blessed Sacrament, the greatest gift of our dear Lord's Heart." We repeat it often daily, but

⁵ Bruce, Milwaukee, and Coldwell, London. pp. vii., 178. 6s. 6d.

⁶ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. pp. xi., 114. 3s. 6d.

⁷ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. pp. ix., 132. 5s.

do not always realize its beauty, how it is a compendium of what we should know about our heavenly Father and His kingdom. Hence these conferences explain at length the notion of God's Fatherhood, the meaning of Heaven and the sense of the seven petitions. By pondering them readers will be able to mean fully the leading thought of each petition, and will have matter for reflecting on the various petitions when time allows, during meditation, for example. We need never be afraid of repeating the same thoughts in our prayers; God loves to be bored by our supplications and entreaties. The Our Father, recited slowly, is at all times helpful to the soul, but it is particularly helpful when we are grievously ill and unable to pray much. So he argues, with much wisdom. A full analytical index at the end of the book gives the leading ideas of the discourses; each section could serve as a meditation in itself, apart from the more developed treatment in the body of the book. The style is slightly foreign; but that need not deter anyone from perusing and assimilating this inspiring book which will guide him to the pith and marrow of Catholic piety.

Another book of most excellent conferences, this time for religious, is *Our Light and Our Way*, translated from the French of the Rev. Basil A. Moreau, Founder of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, by an American sister of the Congregation.⁸ The subjects treated are the Religious Rule, meditation, the Divine Office, community spirit, venial sin, Confession, Holy Communion, the Retreat, renewal of the vows, the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Heart of Mary, St. Joseph. The spirit running through them is partly Sulpician and partly Ignatian. I would agree with the claim made in the Preface that they "are characterized by solidity of doctrine, great piety, and an eloquence which recalls the early Fathers." The translation is very readable. Another book for religious, also well translated from the French of the Bishop of Vannes, is *A Return to the Novitiate*.⁹ In some religious institutes an actual return to the novitiate is decreed for a series of exercises before perpetual vows are taken. In others the actual return is supplied by a long retreat. In other cases again such a retreat is not possible. This book is written to meet this last situation. It envisages the performance of religious exercises, privately, or better, under authorized direction; and furnishes material for those exercises, divided into three sections, each intended to cover a week. In the first week the meaning of the religious life is considered, in the second its obligations, and in the third its supports. Each section contains seven discourses, meditations and examens on a fundamental element of the religious life.

The only biography to hand this time is *The Foundress of the Sisters of the Assumption*, by Father Martindale, S.J.¹⁰

⁸ Bruce, Milwaukee, and Coldwell, London. pp. ix., 339. 12s.

⁹ New York, P. J. Kennedy & Sons. pp. xiv., 289. \$2.0.

¹⁰ Preface by the Archbishop of Westminster. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Seven illustrations. pp. xiii., 155. 5s.

It is a rapid sketch, done with all Fr. Martindale's ability to seize the distinctive features of a personality. Mother Marie-Eugénie herself is firmly delineated; so too are her first director and originator of her Congregation, the tempestuous Abbé Combalot; and her first novice mistress, the saintly Irish Mother Thérèse-Emmanuel. Eugénie Milleret was brought up in the Voltairean atmosphere of French society in the early nineteenth century. Converted by Lacordaire, she came under the influence of Combalot and discovered her life-work, the establishment of a teaching order of nuns, differing from contemporary foundations in that it based its spirituality firmly on the Mystical Body and on the importance of full liturgical prayer, and had as its educative aim not merely the passing of examinations, but the training of well-mannered, competent Christian mothers of the future. The spirituality of the Foundress herself was built up on the natural virtues of generosity, loyalty, honesty and frankness; which may commend her to English readers. Fr. Martindale's brightly written, vivid and convincing portrait deserves a place of honour among the many notable biographies that he has written.

II. ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY.

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

Now that young Catholics attending the Universities are growing more numerous, the problem of providing them with Catholic books on subjects which lend themselves to anti-Catholic treatment by professors who are agnostic or even atheist is becoming pressing. The subject of sociology, in the hands of a teacher who is sufficiently unscientific to accept all the conclusions of the evolutionist school, may cause serious difficulties to a Catholic who has no means of checking those conclusions. Take, for instance, the question of monogamy. Our Catholic students may be taught at the University that monogamous marriage is the product of a long evolution, which began with primitive promiscuity or "group marriage," passed into polyandry first and then into polygyny, before settling down into the legal institution which is normal to advanced communities. This, of course, is the theory of the Bachofen-McLennan school, though it has been rejected by the rationalist Westermarck. Or again, our Catholic students may be taught some theory of primitive Communism in property, or some quite indefensible views about the origin of religion. Quite apart from the problem of helping Catholic University students, the same type of question may arise in connection with one or other of the books or periodical publications dealing with primitive races and primitive cultures and now more numerous than ever before.

It is impossible for the majority of priests to keep in touch with the anthropological literature which would enable them to correct the mistakes of slap-dash sociologists, and therefore a

very hearty welcome awaits a most useful little book by Miss Eva Ross, *Social Origins*.¹ Miss Ross divides her book into five parts, with a bibliography. In the first part she gives us a general survey of the question of social origins and its importance: in the second part she deals with the origin of the family. In the third and fourth parts, she discusses the State among primitive peoples and their attitude to private property; while in the fifth part we find a most valuable discussion of primitive religion, with a concise account and refutation of the theories of those who would derive religion from magic, ghost-worship, etc. This is just the book to which a priest may refer an inquirer, whether a University student or one who is puzzled by statements in popular publications. Miss Ross is a thoroughly competent guide through the wilderness of anthropological and sociological theories, and not a merely dilettante student. There is one point, however, on which she might have expressed herself more accurately, viz.: the limits to the right of private property. She writes (p. 63): "This right of ownership is limited in two ways. First, the things owned must be used for their lawful purpose. . . . Then, too, (man) must use his goods, if not to help others, at least not in such a way as to injure them." Miss Ross has not sufficiently distinguished between the limits to the *right* of property and to the *use* of property. On this, *Quadragesimo Anno* (paragraph 47) is, of course, authoritative.

Miss Iswolsky, who, we are informed by the publishers of her book, *Soviet Man—Now*,² is the daughter of a former Russian ambassador, takes as her theme the modifications introduced into the Bolshevik régime under the pressure of human nature as found in the Russian people. Are the changes which have, in the course of time, been made in the Soviet régime symptomatic of a relapse into "bourgeoisism," or are they merely indications of a temporary retreat, to be succeeded by a new wave of militant Marxism? Miss Iswolsky maintains that one can distinguish between those elements of social evolution in Russia which are "rooted in the very soul of the people" from the accidental phenomena due to the fact that the Government is Marxist, and that there is an extraordinarily active force which has foiled the original Marxist plan. The collectivization of the peasants, for instance, would be claimed as distinctively Marxist, but Miss Iswolsky holds that the original plan has really turned into nothing more than a revival of one of the traditional forms of co-operation, the *Artel*. Again, Marxism and patriotism seem to be essentially in conflict, but the rulers of Russia now insist strongly on the patriotic motive. As to the family, Stalin and his followers have at last realized that they cannot have a healthy State without a healthy family, and so we are witnessing the first signs of a reaction towards a "stabilization" of the family. A new humanism and the growth

¹ Sheed & Ward. 3s. 6d.

² Sheed & Ward. 2s. 6d.

of a new élite are further phenomena of enormous importance in Russia. Even religion has not been crushed, in spite of all the efforts of the militant atheists. What the future will bring forth no one can safely prophesy in detail; but this at least seems certain, that in the conflict between Marx and Man the final victory will go to human nature.

The decline of Marxism is discussed even more fundamentally in *Marxismus am Ende?* by Lorenz Brunner.³ Instead of a society based upon social justice, Russia shows a society based upon brute force. The Marxist socialists of other countries have had their position undermined by the disappearance of "bourgeois" democracy, to which they were hostile. The Popular Front uniting temporarily those ancient enemies, Communists and Social Democrats, is a further proof of Marxist weakness. And, finally, the weapon of dictatorship with which Marx threatened bourgeois society has been seized by hands which use it to destroy Marxism. This is a very inadequate summary of an analysis which is clearly the work of a first-rate social philosopher.

The intellectual activity of Sir Josiah Stamp must surely be a source of wonder and admiration to all interested in economics and statistics, but not all who study his output of lectures and writings in these fields are aware that he is deeply concerned with the problems which arise when one attempts to apply Christian teaching to social and economic life. In *Motive and Method in a Christian Order*⁴ he explicitly addresses "the younger generation of preachers," not, he tells us, with the purpose of proving anything, but in order to suggest considerations and disciplines which should precede the formation and promulgation of views upon a more Christian order. At the risk of misrepresenting his opinions by summarizing them, one may say that he would have the pulpit confined to the effort to convert men to Christ, or to confirm them in their desire to serve Him, and would exclude from it any attempt to formulate an ideal social and economic order. A better order, he rightly says, is "compounded of character and machinery, of motive and method," and he assigns the formation of character and motive to the pulpit, the provision of social machinery and economic method to the economic expert. As an illustration of clerical trespassing in forbidden fields, he instances the advocacy of Major Douglas's Social Credit scheme by members of the clergy, and, after arguing in detail that the scheme is entirely impracticable, he concludes that "there are no more morals or ethics about it than there are about a locomotive," because the *machinery* of the scheme is unworkable, no matter how excellent the motives of those who might try to work it.

At first sight it might appear that Sir Josiah Stamp is saying no more than Pius XI has said in *Quadragesimo Anno* (para-

³ Benziger: Einsiedeln. 4.30 francs.

⁴ Epworth Press. 6s.

graph 41): "She (the Church) never can relinquish her God-given task of interposing her authority, not indeed in matters of technique, for which she has neither the equipment nor the mission, but in all those that fall under the moral law"; but on further consideration it appears that he ascribes to ethics a much narrower field than Pius XI does. He seems to consider that because ethics is concerned with motives it is no way concerned with "social machinery." Yet one feels sure that he would not deny the existence of moral rights, respect for which must enter into all motives which ethics can approve; or that certain forms of social machinery foster and strengthen good motives, while others give free play to, if they do not actually encourage, bad motives. Under both these heads the moralist finds himself obliged to pass judgment upon social institutions. The right of the community to the pursuit of welfare conflicts with any economic machinery that would hinder welfare; so that, if Sir Josiah Stamp is correct in his condemnation of the Douglas scheme on technical grounds, the scheme must be condemned on moral grounds too. The right of individuals to associate for legitimate purposes is the basis of the Church's commendation of such social machinery as trade unions and employers' associations, just as her doctrine about the State (an important piece of social machinery) is based upon the rights and duties which derive from the social nature of man. Sir Josiah Stamp, unlike Mr. Keynes, appears to condemn the Catholic position with regard to usury, for he refers to a recent Catholic writer as having "a curious hankering after the current validity of mediæval ideas." This quaint comment is hardly worthy of its author, and suggests that he has given no real thought to the social principles of the Church. It is enough here to notice that the Catholic prohibition of usury is founded upon the essentially moral concept of commutative justice. Again, free and unrestricted competition, as the Pope has remarked, tends to favour the unscrupulous at the expense of conscientious competitors, with the result that the moralist cannot be indifferent to it. The long and the short of it is that ethics cannot be indifferent to social or economic machinery, for the simple reason that *the wheels are persons*. This is not to say that the economic specialist has no field of his own or that the clergy are economists; any more than to say that ethics cannot be indifferent to the art of medicine and the methods of its practitioners is to say that the clergy are doctors. One can heartily agree with Sir Josiah Stamp's desire for co-operation between technical economic experts and moralists, for each class will have something to learn from the other.

The Coming Civilization by Kenneth Ingram⁵ is a pleasantly written, if rather superficial, survey of many of the questions which attract the attention of the man in the street nowadays.

⁵ Allen and Unwin. 6s.

In Part One, the author inquires whether Capitalism will endure? He objects to labelling the sort of civilization he would like, but it appears to be what most people would call Socialism. In Part Two, he urges that the Coming Civilization should be Christian. There is no space here for a detailed criticism, but one must protest at the attempt to put Bolshevik massacres on the same footing as the killing of enemies in time of war.

Finally, the attention of our readers must be called to a new book by Dr. Waldemar Gurian (author of *Bolshevism*, etc.) dealing with the modern religious struggle in Germany. It is entitled *Der Kampf um der Kirche im Dritten Reich*, and is published by the Vita Nova Verlag at Lucerne. The name of the distinguished author is sufficient guarantee of the value of this book.

III. HISTORY.

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, L.Sc.Hist.

In his new book, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*,¹ Dr. Jordan continues his investigation of the way in which the spirit of toleration in religious matters developed in England at the time of the Counter-Reformation. It is the age of St. Robert Bellarmine and King James I, of Laud and Prynne and the Thirty Years' War that is here his subject. Once more he is to be congratulated on a very thorough analysis of all the material available and on his constant endeavour to do justice to all the parties in the long controversies with which he has to deal. In two chapters on *The Dominant Group* he examines the policy of the official mind of the day—the government of James I and Charles I and its chief religious advisors and agents the Anglican episcopate—first, with regard to the Puritans and next with regard to what the author styles Roman Catholic Nonconformity. Three more chapters analyse the ideas of the "Minority Groups," namely, the Calvinistic puritans, the Congregationalists and the Baptists, of the Laymen and the Moderates, and, finally, Roman Catholic Thought and its relation to the development of religious toleration.

All the thinkers of the first half of the great seventeenth century pass through Dr. Jordan's pages: Chillingworth, Hales, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Bacon, Sir Thomas Browne and Arminius too. Inevitably, no more than a few pages can be spared to each, and here it would be unfair to the author of this industrious survey to expect the impossible, that is to say, a full exposition of each thinker's contribution. For that a book of the dimensions of Bremond's *Histoire du sentiment religieux* would scarcely suffice.

Dr. Jordan's work has a particular interest for Catholics, for

¹ George Allen & Unwin. pp. 542. 21s.

in it he attempts what has so far been too much for any Catholic's courage—a literary history of the Catholic thought of the time. To an author who has revived the great name of Matthew Kellison every Catholic student must feel grateful. This is not to say that we accept Dr. Jordan's account unreservedly. He is inclined to accept as true whatever his sources offer him, and an acquaintance with Fr. Broderick's great life of St. Robert Bellarmine would have helped him considerably. That book, however, is not even mentioned, nor is Dr. Albion's more recent work on *Charles I and the Court of Rome*. Dr. Jordan's account of Catholicism in these years is, indeed, little more than a series of transcripts from the reports of the Venetian ambassador. Occasionally, too, there are statements of fact, of immense import, thrown out quite casually and without any hint as to the authority that warrants them. This, for example: "The Jesuits had bitterly opposed the appointment of a secular bishop who should be charged with the interests of the English Catholics and who, in a sense, would be responsible for their good conduct. In 1629 their influence resulted in a proclamation banishing Smith, the titular bishop of Chalcedon. Smith sought refuge in the French embassy, where he remained until 1631, while the Jesuits were active in Rome securing his recall."

Fr. Duhr's little book² (a publication of the Muséum Lessianum) deserves a very warm welcome, for it tells in vivid fashion the details of a story known to all of us perhaps in outline, and whose bare outline must always stir our curiosity to know more and still more. For Adam Schall was, after Matteo Ricci, the most celebrated of all those Jesuit missionaries who laboured in China three hundred years ago. It was at once his joy and his cross that it was his mathematical prowess that won him protection and favour at the court of the different emperors in the first half of the seventeenth century, the last of the Ming dynasty and the first of the Mantchu conquerors. Here we have the whole romantic story brilliantly set forth and we learn the price at which its hero bought his fame.

We see this great German savant battling against the intrigues of the Chinese scientists whom his superior learning displaced, against the prejudices which, inevitably, his character of a Christian and a priest aroused and against frequent misunderstanding on the part of other Catholics and even of his own brethren. He rose, nevertheless, to be the "astronomer-royal" of the celestial kingdom and, under the emperor Shun-chih, to be one of the chief influences in the imperial counsels, a mandarin of the first class, decorated with the title of "The Master who scrutinises the secrets of the heavens" with precedence equal to that of the princes of the blood. His

² *Un Jésuite en Chine: Adam Schall, Astronome et Conseiller Impérial* (1592-1666). Published by L'Édition Universelle, 53, Rue Royale, Brussels. pp. 184. 25 francs.

parents, his grandparents and all his ancestors to the third degree were ennobled, too. But Adam Schall remained at heart the missionary. From his chapel, built for him by the emperor, the good work continued to go forth and a steady stream of conversions among the nobility was the result. The emperor himself was gradually drawn into the track of this apostolic activity and, although Schall never saw realized his cherished hope of the emperor's conversion, his instructions certainly brought about a gradual and unmistakeable improvement in the imperial morality.

No doubt to the missionaries to whom fell a less distinguished sphere of operations, for whom no mandarin's prestige softened the harsh places of life, Schall's progress caused more than a little anxiety. But God, who readeth the heart, knew His servant, and the life of devotion that lay beneath the pomp and circumstance of the princely astronomer was revealed for all the world to see in the sufferings for the faith which filled Schall's last years. Shun-chih died in 1661, prematurely at twenty-three years of age. His heir was a baby and the regency gave Fr. Adam's enemies their chance. He was arrested, degraded, imprisoned and finally sentenced "for daring to teach that Christ, a crucified criminal, is the Lord of the earth and the heavens." He was now an old man of seventy-four, half-paralyzed, and for a year he lay in prison, chains on his feet and round his neck, while friends and foes outside fought over him. Finally, after a new trial, he was sentenced to death, to be cut to death slice by slice, hot irons being applied to the wound immediately after the knife had done its work, and then the knife again. Schall, a true servant of the cross, rejoiced. But God delivered him through that world of astronomical marvels in which he had come to his spiritual perfection. At the very moment when the regent presented the death warrant for the child-emperor's signature, an earthquake threw down the greater part of the palace and much of the capital also. There were two more shocks that day and three shocks the day that followed. Next a thunderbolt fell on the palace and what was left standing by the earthquake went up in flames. The authorities hastened to remit the sentence and Fr. Adam was set free. He died a year later, on the Feast of the Assumption, 1666, harried and persecuted to the last by the native astronomers who were now in power.

This life by Fr. Duhr, S.J., is an adaptation of the great German work of Fr. Vaeth, S.J.—a truly scientific life written by one who is an authority on all that relates to China and the Chinese mission of the seventeenth century. This excellent adaptation is illustrated with several maps and two portraits of Fr. Adam.

There are few things for which the present age is more indebted to Mr. Belloc than his continual insistence that history is the record of *human* activity. In the development of states, the rise and fall of cultures, the ebb and flow of even temporal

prosperity, what matters primarily is the activity of man's free judgment and the will that follows upon it. To have insisted on this through forty years of continuous historical writing, in a generation which increasingly speaks of development and change as the outcome of abstractions, of "tendencies," "movements," and a host of cumbrously named "isms," is no little merit in a man. And it has been appropriate reward for Mr. Belloc that his great literary gifts have never been better displayed than in his studies of the great men upon whose action the fate of whole nations has at one time or another depended.

All the more regretfully, therefore, must we state that his latest essay in this kind of literature³ does him very much less than justice even as a writer. Repetition, elaborate analyses of the obvious, an abundance of platitudes make the reading a task. Mr. Belloc has at last produced a book that is dull.

Whether these twenty-three slight sketches are true portraits of the several characters and justly estimate their action and its importance, is, of course, matter for discussion. Two men looking at the same scrap of evidence from which they must reconstruct how a man's mind worked four hundred years ago can, very often, come, quite reasonably, to different conclusions, and it is sometimes the case that no one can settle which of the two presentations is the nearer to the reality that was. On the other hand, there are cases where we are left wondering how far the historian is the unconscious victim of pre-judgments, fantasies, personal eccentricities and the like. The ultimate test, and none has insisted more on this than Mr. Belloc, is the dispassionate study of all the actual remains, the *relicta*, of the man under discussion. By these must we judge the writer and his presentation.

I suggest that if by this canon we judge, for example, the study in the present book of St. Thomas More we must pronounce it a travesty that finds no warrant in all that research has brought to light concerning the saint's life. This is not a question of slips in unimportant detail—the statements here denied to be true are vital to Mr. Belloc's portrait of the saint and the degree of the error is such as to shake one's confidence in the author's knowledge of his subject.

St. Thomas was "born in the high and wealthy legal world." No; he was the eldest son of a barrister who had a large family and was a poor man just beginning to make his way in the world.

"He inherited . . . the greatest honours and legal position." No; his father died only five years before the saint, and indeed lived to see his son at the very height of his career.

"He began as a man of profound worldly ambition"—the man who from his early twenties wore a hair shirt, used the discipline, lived a life of systematic prayer and meditation and, in short, as near as might be, lived in the world the life of a Carthusian.

³ *Characters of the Reformation*. Sheed & Ward. pp. 340. 10s. 6d.

"He fully recognized his own talents and he gloried in them. They had led him to the highest political position in the State." Yet the law, in its study and its practice alike, was repugnant to him. And it was with the greatest reluctance that he entered the royal service and remained in it.

He was naturally a "drifter" and his whole life, his indignation against abuses, his wit, and his high literary talent seemed to foretell for him an ultimate violent opposition to the Divine unity in the Church. What an astonishing conclusion to draw from the premises!

"He laid down his life for one small, strict point of Catholic doctrine . . . a point on which he himself had long doubted. . . . All Christendom was debating whether the Pope was head of the Church." Here we must emphatically and bluntly say "No" once more. The sentence in italics—the author's italics—is contrary to the facts. As to the rest, no Catholic has ever been free to deny the papal *supremacy* in the Church, nor has anyone ever denied it and, as they say, got away with it. There had been Catholics, influential Catholics, who, a hundred years before the Reformation, held the General Council to be superior to the pope. But these were never more than a small, if noisy, minority, and the Church was no sooner back to normal conditions after the Western Schism than these were condemned—and by a General Council itself. Nor did the movement, such as it was, survive this condemnation, as the ludicrous farce of the Council of Basle and the last of the anti-popes proves ("Felix V" in 1449). In St. Thomas More's own lifetime an attempt had been made to revive the controversy and to give the theory practical expression, in the political interests of Henry VIII's brother-in-law Louis XII of France. The show made by these innovators and their Council of Pisa (1511) was more contemptible even than the farce of Basle sixty years earlier. Their attempt, as far as regards theological demonstration, was blown sky high by Cajetan, and, more importantly, condemned by the act of the succeeding General Council—Fifth Lateran in 1517 (the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*). Three years later the bull condemning Luther solemnly reasserted the traditional doctrine. As there has never been a time when a Catholic was free to doubt, so there has never been a time when Catholics "universally debated" whether the pope is the Head of the Church. Nor, of course, could there ever be such a time once the matter had been the subject of explicit definition, as, by St. Thomas More's time, was the case.

Finally, what is one to make of the extraordinary misunderstanding of the nature of Faith and of the act of martyrdom that a canonization solemnly exalts, with which the study concludes? The saint, we are told, had a sceptical mind, and was used to see both sides of any question, and to think anything could be argued. He had no support, in his hour of trial, from any of the outward circumstances of his life. What help had he from within? Very little, says Mr. Belloc. "I suggest

that the Martyr in his last moments had all the intellectual frailty of the intellectuals, and that at the end his scepticism was still working; but his glorious resolution stood—and that is the kernel of the affair. He had what is called 'Heroic Faith.' . . . He had nothing whatever to uphold him except resolve."

IV. LITURGICAL ARTS AND CRAFTS.

BY THE REV. J. P. REDMOND.

Treatises in English devoted exclusively to Christian symbolism are strangely few. Perhaps we Catholics, familiar, as we are, from earliest childhood with the use of religious symbols of one kind or another, are inclined too much to take the subject for granted. We presume that we know all about it, and only when put to the test do we discover our deficiencies.

Artists engaged in ecclesiastical work, especially sculptors and stained glass workers, frequently find themselves wondering where to enquire for information as to the correct and traditional symbols to be used in relation to the particular piece of work in hand. Up to the present no English Catholic expert has thought it worth while to commit his knowledge to a handy book for the use of artists. But such a book is sorely needed, and anyone who feels induced to embark upon the undertaking might well take for his model the *Dictionnaire du Symbolisme* which is being issued quarterly, in Belgium, as a supplement to the magazine, *L'Artisan Liturgique*, published at that very active liturgical centre, the Abbey of Saint André, Lophem lez Bruges.

The following is, as far as we have been able to discover, a complete list of English books on Christian symbolism: *Symbolism in Christian Art*, F. Edward Hulme, 1891; this is a useful book, well stocked with information and well illustrated, but too discursive; *The Romance of Symbolism*, Sidney Heath, 1909; this book also has a number of good illustrations and much valuable material of interest to antiquarians and folklore students, but the utility of the work is marred by the author's ignorance and stupid misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine and practice. Two others are Allen's *Early Christian Symbols in Great Britain and Ireland*, and Greene's *Saints and their Symbols*, 1904; the interest of the former is mainly archaeological, and the latter is, as the title indicates, a specialized study.

Meanwhile, two noteworthy volumes have arrived from America. *Christian Symbols and How to Use Them*, by Sister M. A. Justina Knapp, O.S.B.,¹ is a well-meaning, and courageous, but not very successful effort. Sister Knapp's short history of symbolism would convey a sufficiency of knowledge to one who was utterly ignorant of the subject. But any advantages which might be gained from a reading of the introductory chapter would be

¹ Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company. \$2.

negatived by the dull and uninspiring illustrations. These latter are obviously the results of much patient industry; but, unfortunately, the author has chosen most of her examples from the worst periods of decay when symbols were deliberately invented with all the artificiality and sophistication of the confectioner of wedding-cakes.

Symbols in the Church, by Carl Van Treeck and Aloysius Croft,² is better. As the authors themselves modestly admit, the book is far from perfect. Here again the drawings are heavy and unattractive, and if students of ecclesiastical art should pay serious attention to the authors' recommendation of their work as "a practical, usable handbook for ecclesiastical artists and craftsmen of all sorts," we may have a dreary perpetuation of those over-elaborated and sophisticated inventions of the renaissance and following centuries, such as the eighteenth-century Augsburg designs to the invocations of the Litany of Loreto. The opening chapter on Symbolism and Symbols in general is both instructive and stimulating.

The term *symbol* has been stretched far beyond its original significance so that now it is freely used of type, allegory, emblem and attribute, as though these were all interchangeable. Tracing the word down to its roots we find that it originally meant a throwing together; a symbol therefore may well be described as an attempt to give concrete expression to an abstract idea by combining it, or throwing it together, with a visible, representative sign. A type or prototype is a figure of something to come; the brazen serpent, for example, while considered in its Old Testament setting; but when regarded in relation to the fulfilment of what was prefigured it becomes a symbol. Allegory is concerned with fictitious things and imaginary persons and happenings; it differs from ordinary fiction in that the subjects represent virtues and vices and abstract qualities, and the purpose is didactic.

An attribute, or emblem, is a sign added to a particular figure to distinguish it from others, having also a reference to some virtue or event or condition in the life of the person so distinguished; St. Peter's keys, for example. Ordinarily an emblem is meaningless apart from the representation of the person with whom it is associated; but, mainly through the influence of heraldry, some well-established emblems have acquired a symbolic value. The heralds of the later Middle Ages were horrified to discover that such distinguished persons as Saints Peter and Paul were without arms, and so the English court in a special session, made them a grant.

Christian symbolism is a picture language: throughout the ages it has served a twofold purpose; it has discreetly veiled the doctrines of the Church from profane and misunderstanding eyes; it has helped to impress the truth of religion upon the

² The Bruce Publishing Company. \$2.50.

minds of the unlettered. The symbols of the very early ages of Christianity, such as one sees in the catacombs and on early Christian monuments, are simple and direct, and strike the beholder as having been created with a spontaneity of thought. The mediæval artists inclined more towards pictorial effects, as we see in the well-known symbols of the Holy Trinity and of the Five Wounds. Symbolism suffered in the general decay of Christian art which began with the renaissance, so that, as we have already noted, symbols became artificial and exaggerated and lacking in sincerity. It would be quite safe to say that symbolism as a secret language and a medium of instruction has run its course. It would be impossible to invent a new and convincing symbol for the simple reason that the need which called the early and mediæval symbols into existence is no longer felt. Symbols have ceased to be a secret language, and they have outlived their utility as a vehicle of instruction. Nowadays their use in Christian art is mainly to serve as liturgical decorations, though, no doubt, at the same time they do recall the truths of faith to the minds of the devout.

While admitting that it would be impossible to lay down hard and fast rules for the direction of artists, the authors of *Symbolism and Symbols* have made a number of useful suggestions. In the first place, symbols should not be used merely because they are symbols. The decoration of church walls or windows must not consist of a collection of archæological curiosities. In general, the use of symbols should aim to impart a liturgical spirit to the decoration of sacred things, and those symbols and combinations of symbols should be chosen which best conduce to this end. Some of them can be shown in series, others must stand alone. Serious study and good taste, coupled with religious sense, will dictate the proper symbols to use in particular cases. It is necessary, in the second place, to guard against overloading any decoration with symbols. Over-rich use of symbolic designs will not make an artistic work of something that is weak in itself. The use of symbols is in itself a secondary matter; artistic fitness and liturgical correctness are the primary requisites.

To this summary we might add that artists should observe logical sequence; they should not mix up the symbols of periods far distant from one another, and if engaged upon work which is true to local traditions, they should likewise choose their symbols to match, for in this matter every country has its own traditional predilections.

Strangely enough the authors recommend the student who " . . . would go more deeply into the subject of mediæval symbols " to apply himself to the *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of Durandus. This work which is full of " quaint conceits " first saw the light in 1286. Durandus is not altogether to be despised; his symbolic interpretation of the Mass vestments, the first of the kind, still finds acceptance. Nevertheless, the *Rationale* could easily be a dangerous book in the hands of an

amateur, for Durandus read symbolic meanings into everything and there were few things in the Church's usage which he overlooked. His method is admirably exemplified in a typical passage which to the extent of about three hundred and fifty words explains that church bells are symbolic of preachers.

Mr. Aymer Vallance's long-expected book, *English Church Screens*, has at last appeared. The book, a very beautiful production from the house of Batsford, contains about three hundred splendid plates and drawings of old English screens. Mr. Vallance has had the advantage of being able to study all the interesting discoveries which have been made in recent years, and so his book is an improvement upon the few older works on the subject. From the unsparing use of technical terms in the text it would appear that the author addresses himself primarily to antiquarians.

From Saxon times until the ruthless destruction which began in the reign of Edward VI, the great Rood was a feature of every English church. Our Lord was usually represented alive and triumphant, and not infrequently the figure was draped. In the later Middle Ages it became customary to fill in the arch behind the Rood with a tympanum of boards or of wattle and plaster. The purpose of this was to shut out the light which flooded through the east window so that the Rood might be looked at more conveniently. The tympanum was decorated with painted figures, and the space above the arch was reserved for a picture of the Doom. Above the Rood was suspended a richly-adorned wooden canopy of honour which was called the celure.

"The origin of screens is lost in remote antiquity," says Mr. Vallance; this may be so, but all the same there can be little doubt that the mediæval chancel screen is a Gothic version of the Roman basilican arrangement of cancelli, ambo and analogium. The word "screen" does not occur until the Reformation period. Previous to that the term "rood-loft" was commonly applied to the complete mediæval assembly of screen, rood and loft. In point of fact there was no essential connection between the screen and the Rood or the loft, and the term "rood-screen," or "rood-loft," derives simply from the close association of the one with the other. We do not find ourselves wholly in agreement with Mr. Vallance when he says: "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that screens have no mystical or didactic significance whatever, but that they are primarily utilitarian, their purpose being to guard and fence the altar." There is no symbolic meaning attached to screens, but considered as barriers separating the Holy of Holies from the body of the church, they certainly have a mystic value. Referring to the low marble balustrade screens of the early basilicas, Cardinal Schuster has written: "The Latins in general have stopped short of this excess of hieratic mysticism which would reduce the people almost to the condition of pariahs; but the primitive elements whence the Byzantine ikonostasis developed are found

in the Latin basilicas from the fifth century onwards, at which period it became customary to stretch curtains between the columns of the podium in order to hide the sanctuary from the sight of the curious multitude."³

Again, we are not disposed to accept unreservedly Mr. Vallance's finding when he declares that the real use and purpose of the rood-loft was to provide accommodation for the choir of singers who were introduced into the services of the church when, about the latter half of the fifteenth century, prick-song, or part-singing, became popular. He admits that there are evidences of isolated rood-lofts long before this period. The fact of the matter is that the loft served a variety of useful purposes: there is good reason to believe that among other uses, the loft provided a platform whence sermons were delivered, and papal and episcopal pronouncements were read. As for the chanting of the Gospel from the loft at High Mass; it is true that the approaches to the loft in many of our small churches are of such restricted limits that it would be practically impossible for a minister in sacred vestments, accompanied by servers, to ascend. It was, however, the custom of the smaller churches to imitate the ways of the greater, and that would be sufficient explanation of the presence of lofts in small churches where, as is most likely, High Mass was never celebrated. If, on the other hand, lofts were not used for the chanting of the Gospel in the greater churches, how can one account for the French term, *jubé*, as applied to rood-lofts? Moreover, it is, or was until recently, and we have not heard of a discontinuance, the usual practice for the deacon to ascend the *jubé* for the singing of the Gospel, in the church of St. Etienne du Mont, Paris.

Mr. Vallance is unduly severe on those who have scrapped the tympana which filled up the chancel arch, and bitterly scornful of those who have dismantled or reduced their screens. Most of us, on the contrary, will be grateful in these days when the faithful are encouraged to look at the Host, that, apart from the appalling destruction of the sixteenth century, the church in England has not favoured a revival of what was after all a clumsy, incommodious arrangement of late introduction. Heavy screens were all very well in days when Masses were frequent and congregations could gather round in small groups, but nowadays when community worship is reviving, it is desirable that all should have free and uninterrupted view of the altar. There is surely something pathetic in the squints, i.e., holes to look through, which so frequently appear in the wainscoting and lower panels of mediæval screens. The Mass is more important than the Rood, but the late mediæval system did, indeed, tend to give the impression that the latter was exalted above the former. Rood-screens are undoubtedly beautiful and

³ *The Sacramentary*, Vol. I, 164.

interesting, but we cannot regret that they have disappeared from modern Catholic use, excepting those of the very lighter kind, and the church cannot be expected to adapt her ritual requirements to suit the sentiments of antiquaries; the modern altar-rail is descended from the screen, and it admirably serves the same purpose of demarcation. It is pleasing, however, to note that the great Rood is quietly coming back into our churches, and perhaps it is not too much to hope that the beautiful specimen in Westminster Cathedral may yet be restored to its rightful place.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

INTENTION OF RECEIVING BAPTISM.

In reconciling to the Church a family with a number of small children, some difficulty arose regarding a child who was not quite seven years old, namely, whether it could be validly baptized without previous instruction. As a matter of fact, some elementary instruction was given, but the child, on being brought to the font resisted strenuously and was most unwilling to be baptized. Was the sacrament validly received? (L.)

REPLY.

We may put on one side everything pertaining to the *fruitful* reception of baptism, faith and the rest, and examine the only relevant point affecting its *valid* reception, namely, the degree of intention necessary on the part of a subject who has attained the use of reason.

That an habitual intention suffices is universally accepted. Moreover, it is commonly held that an implied intention is sufficient, e.g., the desire for baptism contained within the desire to become a Christian, though the person may be entirely ignorant of the nature of baptism. But, since the sufficiency of this implied intention is questioned by some, the common teaching is that one should not be content with it, outside the danger of death,¹ but that an *explicit* intention should be secured. Thus, Canon 752, §2, "In mortis autem periculo, si nequeat in praecipuis fidei mysteriis diligentius instrui, satis est, ad baptismum conferendum, ut aliquo modo ostendat se eisdem assentire seroque promittat se christianae religionis mandata servaturum. §3 Quod si baptismum ne petere quidem queat, sed vel antea vel in praesenti manifestaverit aliquo probabili modo intentionem illum suscipiendi, baptizandus est sub conditione; si deinde convaluerit et dubium de valore baptismi collati permaneat, sub conditione baptismus rursus conferatur."

The *crux* in the above case is to decide whether the child has attained the use of reason. If it has the use of reason, it is subject, as an adult, to the law which requires an intention of receiving baptism. Canon 745, §2: "Cum agitur de baptismo: 1. Parvulorum seu infantium nomine veniunt, ad normam Can. 88, §3, qui nondum rationis usum adepti sunt, eisdem accessentur amentes ab infantia, in quavis aetate constituti. 2. Adulti autem censentur, qui rationis usu fruuntur; idque satis est ut suo quisque animi motu baptismum petat et ad illum admittatur." It is clear that, for the purpose of receiving baptism, an adult is one who enjoys the use of reason, and that the age limit determined in Canon 88, §3, indicates merely a *praesumptio juris*, not a *praesumptio juris et de jure*.² The rule of Canon 88, §3, that an infant is one who has not reached the

¹ Pruemmer, *Theol. Moralis*, III, §135; De Smet, *De Sacramentis*, §273.

² Cf. Cann. 1825 and 1826.

age of seven years completed is a legal presumption which must nevertheless yield to the truth, whenever it is established that the use of reason is enjoyed before that age. If, in a given case, a child under the age of seven is proved to possess the use of reason, it cannot validly be baptized without an intention, in proportion to its years, of receiving the sacrament.

In the case submitted it appears that the sacrament was validly received. If the child had actually attained the use of reason, it could form an intention from the elementary instruction given before baptism; the resistance at the font could be due to sudden fright and in no sense a revocation of the intention formed. On the other hand, if no benefit was received from the elementary instruction, it argues that the child had not attained the use of reason and could validly be baptized as an infant. But, in all such border-line cases, outside the danger of death, it is far better to delay baptism in order that the minimum for its valid reception may be assured.

E. J. M.

INTERIOR OF TABERNACLE.

The correct method of decorating the interior of a Tabernacle is variously interpreted. What are the exact requirements of the law?

REPLY.

Three replies of the Congregation of Rites describe the manner of lining the Tabernacle: "Utrum sit de necessitate interiora Tabernaculorum panno serico albo contegere, an aequivaleat et sufficiat simplex auratura? Resp. Negative ad primam partem; Affirmative ad secundam."¹ "Num . . . debeat omni ex parte interius panno serico albi coloris vestiri, vel possit illud ex laminibus deauratis tantum ornari? Resp. Nihil obstare quoad utrumque modum."² "Utrum sacrum Tabernaculum in interiori parte deauratam esse debeat, vel saltem albo serico contectum . . . ? Resp. Affirmative."³

The law insists, therefore, on a lining of silk or gold. The preference in this country seems to be for the silk. It may be draped or stretched on wooden boards—cedar wood is generally used as it is supposed to resist moth. The useful *Directions for Altar Societies*, compiled by Cardinal Vaughan,⁴ speaks of a lining of gold (solid or gilt plates), but such is rarely seen. We think a gilt wooden lining is permissible as an alternative to silk, and many of the commentators take it for granted that this is the meaning of "auratura" in the decrees, e.g., *Ami du Clergé*, 1911, p. 430, "bois dorée."

What is not required at all, but merely tolerated, is a hanging

¹ *Decreta Authentica*, 3254, ad 7.

² *Ib.*, n. 3709.

³ *Ib.*, n. 4035, ad. 4.

⁴ Burns Oates & Washbourne, p. 11.

curtain *within* the Tabernacle (n. 3150). It may be used, if desired, in addition to the *conopaeum* or veil covering the whole tabernacle without, but it is not a substitute for it.⁵

Lastly, there is required a corporal upon which the Ciborium stands. This is not a special requirement for the Tabernacle as such, but an application of the general law.

E. J. M.

COLLECTION DURING EXPOSITION.

Is there, strictly speaking, any law forbidding the usual church collection to be made during Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament? If there is a law, it appears to be generally disregarded, not only in churches but in convent chapels where the Blessed Sacrament is permanently exposed. (J.O.)

REPLY.

The law is found in §XXVIII of the Clementine Instruction, translated in the English edition¹ as follows: "During the Exposition collecting plates are not to be placed in the church, nor are collectors—clerical or lay—to collect in the church. Nor are beggars to be permitted to seek alms within the church." Gardellini writes in his commentary on this section: "huius finis praecipuus est, quod nulla praebetur occasio fidelibus avertendi mentem et animam ab oratione." He permits, in the case of poor churches, whose means are unequal to the expenses of the function, that a collection may be made at the doors of the church: "Verumtamen magna cum cautela id fieri oportet, cum ne distraherentur ab oratione fideles, tum ne aliquibus eleemosynarum collectio offensioni et scandalo sit."² His ruling is also that of a decree of the Congregation of Rites: "prope scilicet ecclesiae januam et absque rumore."³

The text of the Instruction forbids collections in the church during a "particular" Exposition "delle Esposizioni anche particolari," i.e., Exposition for a shorter period than that of the Forty Hours. As far as we are aware, the collection is usually taken before the Blessed Sacrament is exposed or at the end of the rite, thus observing the law.

E. J. M.

BLESSING OF MOTOR CARS.

Does there exist any specially authorized form to be used in blessing a motor car? (X.)

REPLY.

The Congregation of Rites, March 24th, 1920, approved a special blessing for aeroplanes but there does not exist, as far

⁵ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1934, VIII, p. 407.

¹ Rev. J. B. O'Connell, *The Clementine Instruction*, p. 42.

² *Decreta Authentica*, Vol. IV, p. 101.

³ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3157, ad. 10.

as we know, any special blessing for a motor car. The appropriate one is the formula given as n. 25 amongst the *Benedictiones non reservatae* in the 1925 edition of the Roman Ritual, "Benedictio Vehiculi sen Currus." The prayer is, in fact, the same as that contained in the previous blessing n. 24 for locomotives. Since it is not amongst the blessings given in our English *Ordo* the formula may be useful to many.

"V. Adjutorium, etc. R. Qui fecit, etc. V. Dominus vobiscum. R. Et cum spiritu tuo. Oremus. Propitiare, Domine Deus, supplicationibus nostris, et benedic currum istum dextera tua sancta: adjuuge ad ipsum sanctos Angelos tuos, ut omnes, qui in eo vehentur, liberent et custodiant semper a periculis universis: et quemadmodum viro Æthiopi super currum sedenti et sacra eloquia legenti per Levitam tuum Philippum fidem et gratiam contulisti; ita famulis tuis viam salutis ostende, qui tua gratia adjuti bonisque operibus jugiter intenti, post omnes vias et vitæ huius varietates, æterna gaudia consequi mereantur. Per Christum Dominum Nostrum. Amen. *Et aspergatur aqua benedicta.*"

E. J. M.

VENERATION OF A "BEATUS."

Is it permitted to erect in a church for the veneration of the faithful a statue of a beatified saint who is not yet canonized? If so, is there any difference to be observed between the cultus of such and one who is canonized? (R. A.)

REPLY.

The present law on the subject is contained in Canon 1277: "§1 Cultu publico eos tantum Dei Servos venerari licet, qui auctoritate Ecclesiae inter Sanctos vel Beatos relati sint. §2. In album Sanctorum canonice relatis cultus dulciae debetur; Sancti coli possunt ubique et quovis actu eius generis cultus; Beati vero non possunt, nisi loco et modo quo Romanus Pontifex concesserit." Accordingly there is no difference in kind between the cultus exhibited towards a beatified and a canonized saint; the difference is one of degree, it being restricted, in the case of the beatified, to certain acts and certain places. This is, in fact, the difference between beatification and canonization: by canonization the cultus of a saint is enjoined on the whole Church. In the case, for example, of St. Teresa of Lisieux, the brief of her beatification conceded an office and Mass to the diocese of Bayeux et Lisieux and to the oratories of discaled Carmelites, a concession which carried with it the right to expose statues and relics for veneration, but only in the places mentioned. As to what is permitted in the cultus of a beatified saint, one must consult the particular indult which authorizes it. The Holy See may grant to a "beatus" in a particular place all the privileges which are usually given to a canonized saint, e.g., the dedication of an altar, and the placing of a statue above it.

E. J. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

They That Take the Sword. By Douglas Jerrold. (The Bodley Head. pp. 247. 6s.)

The Abyssinian crisis which appears constantly in the pages of this book is now a thing of the past, but if the League of Nations, the future of which provides the sub-title, had passed along with it *They That Take the Sword* would still be a study which demands the attention of all thinking people; for the fundamentals of the problem herein considered would still be unchanged and the world-tension would have been only partly relieved. Cardinal Liénart wrote last week that there are two doctrinal errors which are responsible for the present evils, atheistic materialism and economic liberalism. Both of these doctrines are here arraigned by Mr. Douglas Jerrold, the second the more formally. Western civilization which has grown out of the Christian tradition formulated in the Middle Ages demands for men the freedom to be and to become. That freedom is being steadily whittled away under a system in which political power is exercised by the forces of secularism. Present progress tends towards "a complete denial of the rights of personality, which constitute the principal affirmation of Christianity and the sole guarantee of personal liberty." The universal desire for peace is being frustrated because it is being sought at the price of the only true freedom.

The various expedients of the European powers to arrest the progress of anarchy are all doomed to failure because they all ignore man's right to be free to worship and serve God: "to co-operate with God." The racist error and the internationalist dream are both exposed, but it is to the origin, the false principles and the utter futility of the League of Nations as at present constituted that the author chiefly devotes himself. Nor will it do for any of us to disdain this issue; to say: "I am bored by the talk of the League of Nations and I don't want to consider it"; or, on the other hand: "It is obvious that the League of Nations, in spite of its failure to secure results up to the present, is our only hope for the peace of the future"; for the League is a fact and a portent, and Mr. Jerrold's well-argued contention is that at present the League is a positive and growing menace to peace and, in its transactions, is divorced from fundamental morality. If these things be so, and if our statesmen are still pinning their faith for the future to the League, and its supposed virtues are being proclaimed from religious and political platforms and placarded on the palings of Non-conformist chapels over the countryside, surely it is our duty to know it for what it is, and to be advised as to what with an infusion of the Christian spirit, it might become. And it is with this last positive contribution to the problem that Mr. Jerrold concludes his book.

No one need be afraid of reading this book because of the supposed dryness or difficulty of its subject-matter. Mr. Jerrold combines with the logical penetration of his analysis a beauty and vivacity of style and a scintillating wit which preclude the possibility of a dull page, and in simple truth he has given us a book more fascinating than most modern novels. I have no doubt that it has already proved a "best-seller" and I hope that its sales will be multiplied; for, no matter what any one may think of his criticisms and conclusions (and he is always scrupulously fair and considerate to his opponents), Mr. Jerrold's premises and arguments are based on a rare combination of reason and faith.

T. E. F.

The Second Spring Series.

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. have launched this new series with three most attractive books which fall in with their "design to form a library of those modern Catholic studies which most deserve attention." Their scheme will prove welcome to the many clergy who having read the books in library copies on their first appearance desire to possess them but have been unable to afford the original cost.

God and the Supernatural appeared sixteen years ago, as a Catholic statement of the Christian Faith by a group of Catholic writers of the first rank. The present volume (price 5s.) is abridged owing to the exclusion of two of the original essays; one by Fr. Knox, who considers that his introductory essay would no longer be an accurate survey of the position; and the other by the editor, Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., who withdraws his essay on *The Person of Christ* because he has dealt with the mystery more adequately in his subsequent book, *In Christ*.

The second book is *The Vatican Council* by Dom Cuthbert Butler in two volumes (12s.). This book was the subject of a very full and informative notice in the first number of the CLERGY REVIEW (January, 1931, pp. 101, ss.), to which the reader is referred.

The third is Professor Alfred O'Rahilly's *Father William Doyle, S.J.* (pp. 613, 6s.), a book whose popularity is attested by the fact that it has gone through four editions and four new impressions before the present one.

T. E. F.

Forgotten Shrines. By Dom Bede Camm, M.A., F.S.A. (Published by Macdonald & Evans. Crown 4to. pp. xvi. and 413, including 90 pp. of illustrations. 12s. 6d.)

We understand that this new popular edition of Dom Bede Camm's well-known book is jointly published by Messrs. Macdonald & Evans and Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Both of these houses are to be congratulated on such a cheap issue of so fine a volume. The edition is reprinted from

the original plates and the beautiful photographs stand out with perfect clearness. The two longest sections in the book are devoted to "The Tragedy of the Fitzherberts" and to "The Skull of Wardley Hall," but the martyrs of every part of the country are represented in the book; and almost any English reader may expect a thrill of local pride as he turns these pages, while many will doubtless learn for the first time details of the martyrs whose relics are close by. It is a timely publication, for the handsome volume would make a most acceptable Christmas present.

T. E. F.

REVIEWS FROM ABROAD

A useful contribution by Dr. Russell in the October ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW deals with the practice of the laity *Offering Holy Communion* for other people. We agree with his plea that the laity should sometimes be reminded that the grace proper to the reception of this Sacrament cannot be transferred from the recipient. On the other hand, there is no need to be too technical about this practice. The merit of going to Holy Communion as an act of religion, the prayers and aspirations, considered as something distinct from the grace received from the Sacrament, can be transferred. Probably, as the writer suggests, the clergy are to blame for any confusion in the minds of the faithful, since we have sometimes allowed the notion of the laity participating in the Sacrifice of the Mass to fall into oblivion. It is natural that the people should want to do something in church. They desire to participate, and in the Mass they have the highest form of *offering*. In the same number Fr. Carroll offers some hints on the *Cure for Voice and Speech Trouble of Priests*. He recommends frequent practice in reading aloud in order to acquire distinctness, audibility and tone. The word for preacher in the New Testament is "herald" and, certainly, the first thing about a herald is that he should be heard.

REVUE THOMISTE (Saint-Maximin) for July-October opens with a biographical article on the Dominican theologian, *Fr. Thomas Pègues*, who died at Dax on April 28th last. He taught theology for many years in the Toulouse province of the Order and latterly in the Angelicum, Rome. Amongst his numerous publications the most noteworthy is the monumental Commentary on the *Summa* in French, a work of thirty-one volumes. Fr. Nevent, in this number, concludes his elucidation of the doctrine about receiving sacraments *in voto*.

THEOLOGISCH-PRAKTIISCHE QUARTALSCHRIFT (n. 4) contains some useful notes on Ecclesiastical Trials, *Lose Blätter zum kanonischen prozess*. They are contributed by Mgr. Treib, the Berlin "Official," and although they are not expressly concerned with matrimonial causes, which are the commonest examples of a

diocesan process, they deal with principles which necessarily apply to them. Marriage problems enter very largely into the other articles and notes of this issue, e.g., *Ursachen der Ehescheidungen und Heilung des Übels* by Fr. van Acken, S.J.; *Eheschweirigkeiten in Missionländern*. This journal is an excellent one and is of a practical or pastoral character.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KATHOLISCHE THEOLOGIE is more speculative and technical. In n. 4 of 1936 we have a study by Dr. Hierzegger, *Collecta und Statio*, dealing with the Roman Stations in the early Middle Ages. Fr. J. Santeler, S.J., of Innsbruck, discusses the principle of causality: *Ist das Kausalprinzip ein blosses Postulat?*

The journal of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, BULLETIN DE LITTÉRATURE ECCLÉSIASTIQUE, a bi-monthly publication, opens with the first portion of an article by Dr. Capéran, *L'Anticléricalisme et l'affaire Dreyfus*, dealing with the political disturbances following upon this famous judicial process.

The chief contribution in the current NOUVELLE REVUE THÉOLOGIQUE is a memorial notice of the late Fr. Vermeersch, S.J., written by his colleague and collaborator, Fr. Creusen, S.J. Three Dutch Jesuits deal with the state of religious teaching in Holland and its dependencies, by submitting a very extensive bibliography of the subject with suitable comments. Fr. de Coninck, S.J., in an account of the *VIIth Congress of Malines*, notes the very prominent part taken by the laity, particularly in the sections concerned with religious life, and suggests that parochial congresses would very likely prove useful and popular.

Of great interest in these days, which are witnessing outbreaks of anti-semitic feeling, is Dr. Peterson's study in EPHEMERIDES LITURGICAE (fasc. 4, 1936) of the Good Friday prayer "pro perfidis iudaeis." The word "perfidious" usually appears in vernacular versions, as in the common English version. But there is reason for doubting whether this is a correct translation of the liturgical Latin. Many ancient texts give to "perfidus" the meaning of "infidelis" or "incredulous," and this is adopted by Cardinal Schuster, amongst others: "gl'infideli Giudei." In the same number Dr. Salaville studies the formation of the *Byzantine Calendar* from the critical researches of Mgr. Ehrhard, and there are some interesting notes, in the practical section, on the Amice.

In addition to the features of purely Franciscan interest. ETUDES FRANCISCAINES (July-October, 1936) contains a notice of Fr. Eupère de Prats-de-Mollo and his part in the foundation of this journal. We are given also the judgment of this historian on *l'Action Française*, written as early as 1913, and showing that the reasons which led to the condemnation of the movement ten years ago were well perceived by him at that time.

ANTONIANUM (fasc. 4) gives an account of John Bremmer and his defence of the doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception*. It contains copious extracts from his published and unpublished

writings. Fr. Baudoux, in a study entitled *Quaestio de Philosophia Christiana*, writes a criticism of the controversy during the last few years concerning the legitimate use of the word "Christian" or "Catholic" as applied to the study of philosophy.

In COLLATIONES NAMURCENSES (n. 5, 1936) Dr. Koerperich, in a note *De Substantia Sacramentorum juxta Concilium Tridentinum*, argues that no strict proof can rightly be drawn from the conciliar text about the problem of the institution of the Sacraments. The solution is rather to be sought in a study of the historical evolution of sacramental rites. The similar journal for Malines, COLLECTANEA MECHLINENSIA (fasc. 6, 1936), contains some reflections by Dr. Gougnard *De Notandis in materia Indulgentiarum*, in which he makes a few necessary modifications in the text of his book, which is probably the best practical manual on the subject. A writer on Indulgences *in specie* is always in a most unenviable position, since his matter is liable to become out of date whilst going through the press. Dr. Gillet gives a succinct explanation of Canon 105 determining the obligations of a Superior to obtain the consent or advice of some subject body.

LA DOCUMENTATION CATHOLIQUE (October 24th, 1936) has assembled in one number all the episcopal instructions delivered, during the last few weeks, against Communism in their respective countries.

FROM THE HOME REVIEWS.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW (October): The Martyrdom of Spain by a Spanish correspondent; Communist Operations in Spain by G. M. Godden; Father Coughlin by Christopher Hollis; London University and Catholic Education by Henry Tristram, Cong. Orat.; Qousque Tandem? by Quaesitor Anglicanus; Chesterton and his Early Romances by R. A. Knox.

THE MONTH (November): St. Teresa and the Society of Jesus by Archbishop Goodier; Communism and Peace; The Lesson of Spain by John Murray; Margery the Astonishing (Margery Kempe) by Herbert Thurston.

BLACKFRIARS (November): Integral Humanism by Gerald Vann, O.P.; Philosophy and the Meaning of History by Gervase Mathew, O.P.; An Evangelical Approach to Catholicism by Victor White, O.P.

CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN (October): Death from a Medical Point of View by Dr. O'Donovan; Sociological and Medical Aspects of Induction of Abortion by Dr. Louise McIlroy; A Russian Abortorium by Dr. Favre.

E. J. M.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

CENTRAL EUROPE.

By C. F. MELVILLE.

1. GERMANY.

The Hierarchy in Germany again draws attention to Nazi pressure against Catholics. The matter was considered recently at a Conference of Bishops at Cologne.

In a Pastoral Letter they state :—

“ Bitter complaints reach us from all quarters that an unbelievable degree of coercion is being brought to bear upon the consciences of many Catholics.

“ In words laden with spiritual pain parents who hold fast to their beliefs have told us how in many place the schools of the powerful organizations to which their children belong endeavour to ridicule in their young eyes the belief of their leaders. Attempts are thus being made to separate these children from Jesus Christ and His Church and at the same time from their own families.

“ Adults belonging to the most varied professions complain that their professional and economic dependence is misused to force them to violate their Christian conscience, to neglect the divine commandments and to fall away from Christ and His Church.

“ The facts upon which these complaints are based are so numerous and well known that there can be no doubt as to their justification.

“ After many vain attempts on our part to remedy, through written protests, the spiritual need of our flocks, the hour has now come when we Bishops, as the accredited spokesmen of the divinely-appointed Pastors of the Catholic people, must ventilate our views publicly.

“ To all who can influence the future of events in our Fatherland we address the following questions :—

“ Are things really to go on as they now are?

“ Is our hardly-trying German people not to be spared even the last and worst experiences?

“ After all their sufferings of the last twenty years, are even their souls to be outraged?

“ Is our people to be so rent asunder that one part honours in Jesus Christ its God and Saviour, as its fathers did before it, while another part mocks at Him and persecutes His followers?

“ Whatever answers may be given to our questions, we Bishops

wish henceforward to leave our intentions in no doubt. We shall continue to promulgate the whole Catholic truth and to hold our flock to the principles of our Holy Faith.

"If you are placed before a painful choice between the worldly success of your children and their spiritual good, be convinced that they will thank you throughout eternity for not allowing them to be separated from the Church.

"If any one of us," the letter concludes, "must suffer for his faith, let him remember to pray for our German people that the life of faith may not be taken away from us and that the nation may not cease to be Christian."

2. AUSTRIA.

An interesting unsigned letter, said to be from a person of eminence, appeared recently in the official Catholic *Reichpost* in which the writer recalls the wisdom of the late Mgr. Seipel.

The Priest-Chancellor, the writer says, once declared that there are two political methods: that of the Prussian General Staff, which calculates all steps in advance, and ends with things going wrong; and the English method of awaiting the development of events and then taking decisions. "I am in favour of the latter method," Mgr. Seipel had declared.

One is reminded of this declaration, the writer continues, when looking at the transformations which have been taking place in the Austrian Patriotic Front during the past three years. The Patriotic Front was never forced upon Austrian political life; it came into being by the force of events.

In 1933 General Karl Vogoin, at the last meeting of the Christian Social Party, pointed out the necessity for effective propaganda for the "Austrian idea," in the face of the dangers then beginning to threaten the Austrian State.

The late Chancellor Dollfuss, realized this necessity. The result was the creation of the Austrian Front, which was to be the common platform for all ready to fight for Austria. A year earlier the Austrian political parties ceased to exist. The necessity arose for getting the support of all Austrians who, while not in sympathy with the political groups within the Austrian Front, were nevertheless ready to work and fight for the new Austria. It was thus that the Austrian Front became the Patriotic Front (*Vaterslandische Front*) of to-day.

During the period of party politics, the interests of the State came second. When, in the days of the Seipel Chancellorship, the Chancellor desired to defend an unpopular measure because of the good impression it would make abroad, a deputy of his party would say: "Excellency, my voters are not the bankers of London or New York, but the peasants of Upper Austria." Both the statesman who was thinking of the whole, and the M.P. who was thinking of the part, were right in their way.

If the formation of political will is left to the parties, the Government must lack firmness of purpose.

Accusations from international Left-wing circles that the Catholic Co-operative system of modern Austria is reactionary and neglects the interests of the workers, are well refuted by the remarks of Federal Minister Dr. Resch, Austrian Minister for Social Welfare, who, at a recent Conference of the Social Workers' Community declared that the S.W.C. is representative of the political interests of the workers, which interests must be considered as pertinent questions.

It was only possible to build up a State on corporative lines if all the workers are filled with that thought.

Social legislation, he continued, is more advanced in Austria than in other countries. In times of economic stress it is difficult to maintain social rights which have advanced so far. It will, however, be the first duty of the Minister for Social Welfare to maintain that which has already been achieved. There are, he said, four cardinal points; matters of social welfare which must be maintained in spite of Budgetary restrictions. They are:— (1) Unemployment Relief; (2) Old People's Welfare; (3) War Invalid's Welfare; (4) Welfare of Small Savers (those people over sixty years of age, who gave every penny to the country during the War).

CORRESPONDENCE

THE "ROMAN" ANGLICAN.

The Rev. R. Langford-James, D.D.(Oxon), writes:—

In the November issue of the CLERGY REVIEW there appeared an article by Mr. Leslie C. Brooks entitled "The Psychological Conflict of the 'Roman' Anglican." Mr. Brooks had obviously tried to understand the "Roman" Anglican and to be as sympathetic as he could be towards him. Accordingly, "Roman" Anglicans cannot fail to be grateful to him. I give my own record in this matter merely to establish credentials, not to claim credit. I have always been a Catholic, so far as belief and practice can make me so. My great-grandfather was Rector of Beaumaris, in Anglesey, and was the only incumbent in the diocese of Bangor at that time to hold a daily service. His daughter, my grandmother, was a very early adherent of the Oxford Movement, and knew some of the leaders personally. For the greater part of her life she lived at Prestbury, near Cheltenham, where that Movement took root very early in its history. It is to my association with Prestbury Church that I owe principally my upbringing in the Catholic Faith. Thus I am, as it were, a sort of hereditary Anglo-Catholic, a point I wish to stress because there are many like me. Our roots have struck deep, and our past is treasured.

I was ordained deacon in 1902, and priest in 1903 by the late Bishop of Norwich. About the year 1908 I met with Mr. Spencer Jones's *England and the Holy See*. I was much impressed by this book, as so many others have been. The then Vicar of Prestbury had taught me the truth about the Papacy. A visit to Caldey Abbey—then, of course, Anglican—completed the process. I contributed to *The Lamp*, in its Anglican days, a series of articles in which I criticized drastically the idea of the "glorious comprehensiveness" of the Anglican Communion, showing that such an idea was novel and alien. I was one of the first in this country to promote the observance of the Church Unity Octave, started by Fr. Paul James Francis, the then editor of *The Lamp*, when an Anglican. There were only about a score in those days who promoted this: there are now over a thousand. That is a really remarkable advance, considering the difficulties we meet with, in a mere quarter of a century.

Soon after I came to work in London, in 1910, I stated, at a very representative meeting of Anglo-Catholic clergymen, that what the Church of England mostly needed was the formation of a papal party within it. I was supported in the projection of this veritable bombshell by Fr. Ronald Knox—then one of us—alone. There are now about three thousand Anglican clergymen who adhere more or less closely to this idea. It should, indeed, have had time by now also to become hereditary. In the ranks of the Oxford reformers there have always been two "schools," one of which has consistently maintained that our true bourn was reunion with the Holy See. Of this school the late Lord Halifax was, in his generation, the most conspicuous representative. But the point I want to stress is that his attitude was no new one.

It is quite possible to maintain that the late Lord Halifax and the late Abbé Portal made a tactical blunder when they chose the question of Anglican ordinations as the first that needed settlement. Tactically they may have been wrong, but otherwise they were surely right, for it involved the whole question of our ecclesiastical position as an organized body. Now the really fundamental point to be noticed—and Mr. Brooks does not notice it—is that the judgment promulgated in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* has never won our acceptance. It is not—*pace* some, but only some, of your theologians—an infallible pronouncement. How could it be, for it is a question neither of faith nor morals? Accordingly we need not accept it, and we do not. We recognize, of course, that, for the time being at any rate, it must be accepted, as a disciplinary measure, by your own theologians in their public writings. But we ourselves have a freer hand. We do not believe that the Anglican Communion is a mere "fortuitous concourse of atoms": we believe, on the contrary, that the providence of God preserved us, in the troubles of the sixteenth century, as an entity still possessing valid Orders, and, in consequence, valid sacraments. It would be difficult to over-estimate the strength of this conviction among us. We

believe that we have already so many proofs of the real fruits of grace among us that it would be sheer blasphemy to deny them; and we are not at all impressed with the idea of grace given outside, but not through, the sacraments as applying to our case. Now that, and not muddleheadedness, is the main reason why we, in spite of very great difficulties and, perhaps, still greater discouragement from our authorities, stay where we are and work for *corporate* reunion from our side. We are convinced that it is God's will that we should.

The late Mgr. R. H. Benson, whom I knew personally, once asked me what steps I adumbrated towards corporate reunion? I replied that I did not know, that such steps were a matter for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and that all we had to do was to cling to principles and to be zealous in our prayers. But in the meantime it is of vital importance that each side should strive to gain a better understanding of the other. I had the privilege for some years here in Birmingham of being the Anglican secretary of the "Monday Circle," a monthly gathering of your clergy and ours. It was a real help in this matter. I venture to offer you these remarks as a further help. And once again, in conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation of Mr. Brooks' evident desire to understand us and to sympathize with us, and to this I venture to add—under my breath—*O si sic omnes!*

[*Editorial Note:* Dr. Langford-James's letter, which for lack of space has been slightly abridged, is welcomed by us as an honest and well-intentioned effort to bridge the psychological gulf between the Catholic and the Anglican mentalities. As such it is complementary to Mr. Leslie Brooks' article. Of course, its appearance in these columns does not mean that we accept the writer's theological arguments or their premises or implications.—THE EDITORS.]

ts
y
ce
to
in
s,
re
re

ce
n?
er
do
rs.
de
I
ng
ly
his
lp.
on
ize
si

ack
an
cal
As
Of
we
or

THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XIV. No. 4. *The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, SS. Cosmas and Damian*

October, 1936

THE HOLY FATHER CONVOKES AN INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL MEETING IN THE VATICAN CITY, EASTER, 1937.

GUILD OF ST. LUKE, S.S. COSMAS AND DAMIAN, THE COMING GENERAL MEETING AT PRESTON, OCTOBER 18th, 1936.

EDITORIAL.—Our Guild—a New Departure. Contraception. Euthanasia. The "Safe" Period. The Catholic Council for International Relations. Centenary of the Royal Medical Benevolent Fund and Epsom College.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES.—Death, from a Medical point of View, by W. J. O'Donovan, O.B.E., M.D., M.R.C.P. (Honorary Secretary to the Guild). Sociological and Medical Aspects of Induction of Abortion, by Dame Louise McIlroy, D.B.E., LL.D.,

M.D., D.Sc. (Lond., Glas., Belfast), M.R.C.P., G.C.O.G. A Russian Abortorium, Dr. F. Favre. Medical Missions and Birth Control, by Sister Eleonore Lippitts, S.C.M.M.

ABORTION, STERILIZATION, CONTRACEPTION.

Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London 42, 44, 46, Newgate Street, E.C.1: 129, Victoria Street, S.W.1: 33, Ashley Place, S.W.1. And at Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow.

Price 1s. 4d. Annual Subscription, 5s. 6d (Post free). Subscription for United States \$1.00.

NOTE.—Editor's Address and Office of the *Catholic Medical Guardian*: Heathwood, Bushey Heath, Herts. Telephone: Bushey Heath 1408.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1730 LTD.

Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY

FRAGRANT INCENSE

IN SEVERAL QUALITIES AND CHARCOAL for use with Incense OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephone: SPEEDWELL 6927

Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON



**chalice
OSBORNE**
117, GOWER ST.
LONDON, W.C.1.
SEND FOR BOOK 16

John Hardman's

John T. Hardman Stained Glass 42 Newhall-Hill
Donald B. Taunton Birmingham &
John Hardman Paintings Mosaics 1, Albemarle
& Co. Limited Church Decoration St. Pancras, London, W.

In Terra Pax

BLACK FRIARS

December, 1936.

A Special Number devoted to the Theology and Philosophy of Peace and War and its applications to the present international situation.

Contributors:

Franziskus Stratmann, O.P.

Luigi Sturzo

Vincent McNabb, O.P.

John Eppstein

Gerald Vann, O.P.

Thomas Gilby, O.P.

Edward Quinn

Bernard Alexander

One Shilling.

Obtainable on order from all booksellers, newsagents and bookstalls; or 1/1½ post free from the Publishers, Rolls House, 2, Breems Buildings, E.C.4.

ANNUALS FOR 1937

THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY

The Official Organ of the English Hierarchy.

One Hundredth Year of Publication.

A Compendium of all necessary information as to the Catholic Church in Great Britain.

Cr. 8vo. Over 1,000 pages. Cloth, 3/6

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO AND YEAR BOOK

Contains more than 5,000 brief biographies of prominent Catholics in the British Empire.

Cr. 8vo. Cloth, 6/-

THE CATHOLIC ALMANACK

A complete Ecclesiastical Kalendar for pocket or desk, with much other valuable information.

Wrapper, 2d.

THE CATHOLIC DIARY

A day-to-a-page pocket Diary, with Ecclesiastical Kalendar.

Cloth, 1/- Leather, 2/6

Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd.,

43-45, Newgate St., E.C.1 and 129 Victoria St., S.W.1

And at Birmingham, Glasgow, Manchester, Liverpool and Dublin

Printed in Great Britain by Gibbs & Bamforth Ltd., St. Albans, Herts.

8

h

6

0

in

/-

d.

/6